

THE HELLENISTIC AND HEBRAIC ELEMENTS  
IN THE PAULINE AND JOHANNINE CONCEPTIONS OF PROPITIATION

A Thesis  
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

from the  
University of Edinburgh

by  
Roy H. Zuefeldt

1957  
(1958)



# ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate Roy House Zuefeldt  
Degree Ph.D. Date 1957  
Title of Thesis The Hellenistic and Hebraic Elements in the Pauline and Johannine  
Conceptions of Propitiation

In each of the three instances that the word "propitiation" appears in the Authorized Version of the Bible, Romans 3:25 and I John 2:2 and 4:10, a member of the *ἱλάσκεσθαι* group of Greek words stands behind the English translation. Consequently, the method of determining the Hellenistic and Hebraic elements in the Pauline and Johannine conceptions of propitiation is to establish in what way this group of words is used in Hebraic and Hellenistic literature and to compare these usages with the manner in which members of the *ἱλάσκεσθαι* group of words are used in the Pauline and Johannine writings. Such a study also involves consideration of the Hebrew words that stand behind members of the *ἱλάσκεσθαι* group of words in the Greek versions of the Old Testament. Moreover, a study of such Hebrew words in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Damascus Document indicates a closer relationship between New Testament Christianity and Palestinian Judaism than has often been realized.

The Hellenistic and Hebraic doctrines of propitiation are similar in that they both view the wrath of God as a personal, active force to be taken seriously, and both doctrines involve the activity of man in some part of the procedure of propitiation. However, their differences are more important than their similarities. In Hellenistic thought, the wrath of a god or the gods is often unprovoked, while in Hebraic thought the wrath of God is usually manifested as the reaction of a holy and righteous God to sin. In Hellenistic thought, man usually takes the initiative and tries to appease the deity, while in Hebraic thought God takes the initiative, and the activity of man is usually limited to responding to or obediently following the means of propitiation established by God. Even the Hebraic sacrificial system is viewed in the Old Testament as the gracious gift of God.

While Hellenistic elements appear in the Pauline and Johannine conceptions of propitiation, they do so only when they are elements also present in the Hebraic doctrine of propitiation, such as taking the wrath of God seriously.





A Hellenistic element, which is not also a Hebraic element, never appears. For the most part, the Pauline and Johannine conceptions of propitiation stand in opposition to the Hellenistic doctrines. Moreover, while both the Pauline and Johannine conceptions of propitiation have several points of contact with the Hebraic teaching, they cannot be equated with it. They both go beyond the Hebraic conception in stressing the initiative of God and the universality and all sufficiency of the means of propitiation that God has provided in Christ.

The uniqueness of both the Pauline and Johannine conceptions of propitiation as contrasted with both Hebraic thought and Hellenistic thought is well expressed by Paul in I Corinthians 1:23-24: "But we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling-block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The kindness, help, suggestions, and encouragement of many people have enabled me to complete this study. The library staffs of the University of Edinburgh, the University of Basel, the University of Heidelberg, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, and Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas, were always accommodating and helpful.

While conversations with many scholars were fruitful, the suggestions and encouragement of the Reverend Professors Norman Porteous and William Manson of New College, University of Edinburgh, and the Reverend Professor Matthew Black of St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, are especially appreciated. The Reverend Mr. Robert Lehman of the West Cameroons, Africa, was helpful in translating certain French works.

The financial assistance of the T. B. Blackstone Fellowship, granted by the Board of Directors of McCormick Theological Seminary, made this study possible and is greatly appreciated.

## PREFACE

. . . There is probably no subject in the world about which opinions differ so much as the nature of religion, and to frame a definition of it which would satisfy every one must obviously be impossible. All that a writer can do is first to say clearly what he means by religions, and afterwards to employ the word consistently in that sense throughout his work. By religion, then, I understand a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life. Thus defined, religion consists of two elements, a theoretical and a practical, namely, a belief in powers higher than man and an attempt to propitiate or please them.<sup>1</sup>

"Propitiation" as a word occurs only three times in the Authorized Version of the English Bible, and not at all in the American Revised Standard Version.<sup>2</sup> Yet a clear understanding of the Pauline and Johannine conceptions of propitiation is essential for a biblical doctrine of the atonement.

One rather extreme view regarding propitiation is that Jesus appeased the wrath of an angry Father and thus propitiated him. This position can lead to the feeling that "Jesus loves me but God hates me," and presupposing civil war among the members of the Godhead.

Diametrically opposed to this view is one which takes the statement, "God is love," and ignores what seems to contradict or modify it. The latter view sometimes leads people to see in the Old Testament a God different from that revealed

---

<sup>1</sup>J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1911), I, 222.

<sup>2</sup>Rom. 3:25; I John 2:2; 4:10. In the RSV it is replaced with "expiation."



in the New Testament. Thoughts of holiness, justice, and judgment become drowned in a tide of sentiment.

Yet when these extremes are avoided, there is room for widely varying interpretations. The difficulty in finding any one English phrase that perfectly conveys the sense of Paul or John and the difficulty in determining what their exact thought was are indicated not only by the Revised Standard Version change from the "propitiation" of the Authorized Version to "expiation," but by the fact that independent modern translators use still other terms to convey what they believe to have been the thought of Paul and John. So Goodspeed uses "a sacrifice of reconciliation"<sup>1</sup> and "an atoning sacrifice"<sup>2</sup> while Phillips renders the Greek with "the means of propitiation, a propitiation"<sup>3</sup> and "personal atonement."<sup>4</sup>

Among scholars who have published studies and commentaries there is no agreement as to what is the best translation. Referring to I John 2:2; 4:10, C. H. Dodd concludes a study of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group of words by concluding, "The common rendering 'propitiation' is illegitimate here as elsewhere."<sup>5</sup> In another thorough study of ἱλάσκεσθαι, Leon

---

<sup>1</sup>Edgar J. Goodspeed, The New Testament, An American Translation (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939); Rom. 3:25.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. In John 2:2; 4:10.

<sup>3</sup>J. B. Phillips, Letters to Young Churches, A Translation of the New Testament Epistles (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955); Rom. 3:25.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. I John 2:2; 4:10.

<sup>5</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954), p. 95.

Morris concludes a consideration of Rom. 3:25 on the other hand with: "It seems best, then, to adopt a meaning like 'means of propitiation.'"<sup>1</sup>

In deciding upon what are the Hebraic and what are the Hellenistic elements in Paul's and John's conceptions of propitiation, it is necessary to consider not only what Paul and John meant when they used ἱλαστήριον and ἱλασμός, but the idea of propitiation in the Old Testament, in Jewish intertestamental writings and in Hellenistic Greek. The most convenient and objective method of making this study will naturally be an investigation of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group of words in the Septuagint, other Greek versions of the Old Testament, non-canonical Jewish writings, and Hellenistic Greek. This will also include an investigation of the Hebrew word group closely associated with ἱλάσκεσθαι words where these Hebrew terms appear both in the Old Testament and in non-canonical Hebrew manuscripts.

It may be that the conclusion will not be startling but will reaffirm earlier interpretations. Yet should this be the case, it is believed that the searching, sifting, and weighing of the evidence involved will provide a more secure foundation for whatever earlier view is reaffirmed.

While the purpose of the study is better to understand the idea and background of propitiation as contained in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Leon Morris, "The Use of ἱλάσκεσθαι etc. in Biblical Greek," pp. 227-233 in The Expository Times (hereafter abbreviated TET), Vol. LXII, No. 8, May, 1951, p. 232.



Pauline and Johannine literature, it has been necessary to devote the bulk of the number of pages to the Old Testament, Jewish intertestamental literature, and various Greek and Hellenistic writings.<sup>1</sup> This has been necessary in order more accurately to evaluate the Hebraic and Hellenistic doctrine of propitiation so as to recognize these elements, should they occur in the Pauline and Johannine literature. The word "propitiation" appears only three times in Pauline and Johannine literature. Over against this, in the Septuagint, the Apocrypha and Pseudopigrapha, and in various Greek and Hellenistic authors, the Greek family of words represented in Romans and I John appears several hundred times.

The spelling throughout follows American usage as set forth by Webster's Collegiate Dictionary and Webster's New International Dictionary.

---

<sup>1</sup>So C. H. Dodd, in The Bible and the Greeks, devotes Chapter 5 to "Atonement." The chapter extends from p. 82 through p. 95, yet less than two pages of print deals with New Testament usage.

Again Büchsel and Herrmann, discussing ἐλάσκεσθαι and its cognates in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933 ff.) (hereafter abbreviated TWNT), III, 300-324, devote only about four pages to ἐλασθήριον and ἐλασμός in the NT.

Also Leon Morris, in "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," pp. 83-95 in Australian Biblical Review, Vol. II, Nos. 3-4, Sept.-Dec., 1952 (Melbourne: Fellowship for Biblical Studies, Dept. of Semitic Studies, University of Melbourne).

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	11
PREFACE . . . . .	111
I. OLD TESTAMENT EVIDENCE . . . . .	1
A. Method of Procedure . . . . .	1
1. Sacrifice . . . . .	1
2. Word Study . . . . .	1
B. Sacrificial Rites and Propitiation in the Old Testament . . . . .	2
1. Vow Offering . . . . .	3
2. Burnt Offering . . . . .	4
3. "P" Authors . . . . .	7
4. Vicarious Nature . . . . .	9
5. Divine Initiative . . . . .	11
6. Summation . . . . .	12
C. ἱλάσκεσθαι and Related Words . . . . .	14
1. Ἐξιλάσκεσθαι . . . . .	15
a. 𐤅𐤓𐤕 . . . . .	16
(1) Oldest Instances . . . . .	18
(2) God as the Subject . . . . .	22
(3) The Priestly Writings . . . . .	25
b. 𐤅𐤓𐤕𐤏 . . . . .	32
c. 𐤅𐤓𐤕𐤏𐤕 . . . . .	33
d. 𐤏𐤓𐤕𐤏𐤕 . . . . .	34
2. Ἐξίλασις . . . . .	37
3. Ἐξίλασμα . . . . .	39
4. Ἐξίλασμός . . . . .	41
5. ἱλάσκεσθαι . . . . .	42
a. 𐤏𐤓𐤕𐤏 . . . . .	43
b. 𐤏𐤓𐤕𐤏𐤕 . . . . .	46
c. Summation . . . . .	48
6. ἱλασμός . . . . .	48

Chapter	Page
7. ἡλεως . . . . .	53
8. ἡλαστήριον . . . . .	57
a. ἡλζυ . . . . .	59
b. ἡλζυ . . . . .	64
c. ἡλαστήριον in the Version of Symmachus . . . . .	71
D. Summation . . . . .	74
II. EVIDENCE IN THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT . . . . .	79
A. Method of Procedure . . . . .	79
B. General Observations . . . . .	80
1. Data . . . . .	80
a. I Baruch . . . . .	80
b. Jubilees . . . . .	81
c. The Assumption of Moses . . . . .	83
2. Summation . . . . .	84
C. ἡλάσκεσθαι and Related Words . . . . .	85
1. ἡξιλάσκεσθαι . . . . .	85
a. Hebrew and Greek Words in Sirach . . . . .	86
b. Other Instances of ἡξιλάσκεσθαι . . . . .	92
2. ἡξιλασμός . . . . .	99
3. ἡλάσκεσθαι . . . . .	105
4. ἡλασμός . . . . .	108
5. ἡλαστής . . . . .	110
6. ἡλεως . . . . .	111
7. ἡλαστήριος and ἡλαστήριον . . . . .	121
D. Conclusions . . . . .	126
III. THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT . . . . .	128
A. Introduction . . . . .	128
B. Material Considered . . . . .	131
1. Qumran Cave I . . . . .	131
2. The Manual of Discipline . . . . .	134
3. Damascus Document . . . . .	141
4. Other Works . . . . .	146
C. Conclusions . . . . .	150



Chapter	Page
IV. GREEK EVIDENCE . . . . .	153
A. Greek Religious Background . . . . .	153
B. ἱλάσκεσθαι and Related Words . . . . .	156
1. Miscellaneous Words . . . . .	156
2. ἵλεως . . . . .	158
3. Ἐξιλάσκεσθαι and ἱλάσκεσθαι . . . . .	160
a. Secular Greek . . . . .	162
b. Jewish Writers . . . . .	166
(1) Strabo . . . . .	166
(2) Josephus . . . . .	167
(3) Philo . . . . .	168
c. Christian Writers . . . . .	171
d. Summation . . . . .	173
4. ἱλασμός . . . . .	174
5. ἱλαστήριος and ἱλαστήριον . . . . .	178
a. Early Usage . . . . .	178
b. Later Usage . . . . .	185
C. Conclusions . . . . .	190
V. NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE . . . . .	194
A. Hebraic and Hellenistic Views Compared . . . . .	194
1. Hebraic Doctrine . . . . .	194
2. Hellenistic Doctrine . . . . .	196
3. A Comparison of Hebraic and Hellenistic Doctrines . . . . .	198
B. Pauline Doctrine . . . . .	199
1. Introduction . . . . .	199
2. Romans 3:21 ff. . . . .	202
a. Δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, and δικαιοῦν . . . . .	202
b. Romans 3:25-26 . . . . .	204
(1) Ἀπολύτρωσις . . . . .	204
(2) Προέθετο . . . . .	207
(3) Διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι . . . . .	211
(a) Deissmann . . . . .	211
(b) Kittel . . . . .	213

Chapter	Page
(c) Calvin, Luther and Morison . . . . .	213
(d) Godet, Gifford, <u>et al.</u> . . . . .	214
(e) Summation . . . . .	214
[1] Ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι . . . . .	215
[2] Διὰ πίστεως . . . . .	217
(4) Romans 3:25b-26 . . . . .	218
(a) Verse 25b . . . . .	218
(b) Verse 26 . . . . .	219
(c) Summation . . . . .	221
(5) ἑλαστήριον . . . . .	222
(a) Masculine Adjective . . . . .	223
(b) ἄμα Understood . . . . .	223
(c) Masculine Noun . . . . .	225
(d) Neuter Noun . . . . .	225
[1] The Means of Propitiation . . . . .	226
[2] תְּפִלָּה . . . . .	226
[3] General Usage . . . . .	232
[a] Expiation . . . . .	233
[b] Propitiation . . . . .	235
3. Conclusions . . . . .	239
C. Johannine Doctrine . . . . .	244
1. Introduction . . . . .	244
2. ἑλασμός . . . . .	248
a. I John 2:2 . . . . .	249
b. I John 4:10 . . . . .	255
3. Conclusions . . . . .	258
APPENDICES	
I. CORRELATION OF VARIOUS GREEK WORDS IN THE LXX WITH HEBREW TERMS . . . . .	264
II. CORRELATION OF HEBREW WORDS WITH VARIOUS GREEK TERMS IN THE LXX . . . . .	276
III. TRENDS IN THE USE OF ἑλασκεσθαι WORDS IN THE MAJOR VERSIONS AS COMPARED WITH THE SEPTUAGINT . . . . .	287



Chapter	Page
IV. RELEVANT WORDS IN NON-CANONICAL LITERATURE . .	292
V. כפר IN THE DEAD SEA MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE .	295
VI. כפר IN THE FRAGMENTS OF A ZADOKITE WORK OR THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT . . . . .	296
VII. כפר IN QUMRAN CAVE I . . . . .	298
ABBREVIATIONS	
A. Books of the Bible . . . . .	299
B. Books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha . .	299
C. Bibliographical References . . . . .	299
D. Other References . . . . .	300
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	302

Chapter I  
OLD TESTAMENT EVIDENCE

A. Method of Procedure

Almost a thousand years elapsed between the first writings of the "J" document and the translation of the last part of the Old Testament into the Greek of the Septuagint.<sup>1</sup> And when the beginning date is pushed back to include the formation of the oral traditions and thought patterns that were later expressed in the written Old Testament, and when the closing date is extended to include the second century A.D. translations of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, several centuries must be added to this basic millennium of composition and translation.

The method of dealing with the concept of propitiation over such a long span of time will be as follows:

1. Sacrifice--An introductory inquiry as to the nature and purpose of the sacrificial system with regard to its relationship to propitiation.

2. Word Study--A study of the *ἰλάσκεσθαι* group of words as they appear in the Septuagint and other Greek texts of the Old Testament. This will be correlated with a study of the various Hebrew words in the Old Testament that are

---

<sup>1</sup>While the LXX is in Greek, it is considered Hebraic in thought. Indeed, though schooled in Hebrew, Paul usually quotes the LXX when he quotes Scripture.

rendered by ἱλάσκεσθαι words in the Septuagint. Special attention will be given to the וָפָח group of words because of the frequency with which this group of Hebrew words is translated into Greek by ἱλάσκεσθαι and cognate words. Special attention will naturally be given to the occurrence of ἱλαστήριον and ἱλασμός as they appear in the Septuagint.

The general method will be to deal first with non-cultic usages and then with cultic usages. Any chronological development that is discernible in a word will be noted, and any change in usage between the Septuagint and the other Greek versions will be considered.

#### B. Sacrificial Rites and Propitiation in the Old Testament

In general, sacrifice is an offering made to God with the design of expressing, securing, or promoting friendly or normal relations with Him.<sup>1</sup>

Propitiate: To appease and render favorable; conciliate.<sup>2</sup>

While some scholars, as Zenos in the quotation above, emphasize the nature of sacrifice as an offering, and other scholars (as Paterson in the quotation in footnote 1 below) consider it communion, they agree that the end in view is the

---

<sup>1</sup>A. C. Zenos, "Sacrifices and Offerings," pp. 793-798 in A New Standard Bible Dictionary (hereafter abbreviated SBD), edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos, 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950), p. 793.

W. R. Paterson also gives as the object of sacrifice: "to secure through communion with a Divine being the boon of His favour." See Paterson's "Sacrifice," pp. 329-349 in A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology (hereafter abbreviated DBT), edited by James Hastings, IV, 330.

<sup>2</sup>Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 5th ed. (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1940), in loc.



favor of God and the "expressing, securing, or promoting friendly or normal relations with Him."

Taking Webster's short definition of "propitiate" as accurately describing the usage of the verb in contemporary English, it is seen that sacrifices whose primary purpose was to express a friendly relation with God were not of a propitiatory nature. But sacrifices whose purpose was to secure or promote friendly relations with God were propitiatory rites, whatever else they might have been.

If a sacrifice appeases, it placates a previous state of wrath. Such was the purpose of the guilt offering (𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤍) as used by the Philistines in I Sam. 6. The Philistine priests and diviners urge the return of the ark with suitable gifts that constitute a guilt offering to the God of the Israelites so that "perhaps he will lighten his hand from off you and your gods and your land." (I Sam. 6:5).

If a sacrifice renders favorable, it does not necessarily presuppose a previous state of wrath as appeasement does, though it does not exclude it. It does presuppose that the worshipper feels at least a doubt as to the attitude of God and perhaps feels indifference.

### 1. Vow Offering

The vow offering is an example of this, at least in its pre-exilic use. "And at the end of four years Absalom said to the king, 'Pray let me go and pay my vow, which I have vowed to the Lord, in Hebron. For your servant vowed a vow while I dwelt at Geshur in Aram, saying, "If the Lord will indeed bring me back to Jerusalem, then I will offer worship to the Lord"' (II Sam. 15:7-8). In this and several other instances of the vow (𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤍) in pre-exilic times, a vow

was made to implement a request.<sup>1</sup> The vow often approached a quid quo pro offer to God. In the listed examples the vow was not paid, moreover, until the request had been granted. In fact, in practice many people vowed a vow in time of great fear or desire, and when that which they requested was brought to pass, they forgot to pay the vow. Thus Deut. 23:21-23 make it clear that while the making of a vow is voluntary, if it is not promptly paid, it will provoke the Lord to wrath; it is sin; and God will require payment of the vow from the person. Thus, once a vow has been made and God grants the request, even as the vow at the outset had a propitiatory note in attempting to make God more favorable to the petitioner, so now the vow offering must be paid to avert the wrath of God at a broken contract.

## 2. Burnt Offering

The burnt offering or whole burnt-offering (עֹלָה) is one of the three types of sacrifice met with in the older Hebrew literature<sup>2</sup> and is probably the oldest and most general of all sacrifices.<sup>3</sup> Of the three early offerings, it was probably the burnt offering that served to express repentance and entreat the favor of God when there was any evidence of

---

<sup>1</sup>Gen. 28:20-22; Num. 21:2-3; Jud. 11:30-31; I Sam. 1:11.

<sup>2</sup>A. R. S. Kennedy, "Sacrifice and Offering," pp. 810-818, in Dictionary of the Bible (hereafter abbreviated DoB), edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), p. 812. The other two sacrifices met with in the older literature are the peace offering and the meal offering.

<sup>3</sup>Zenos, op. cit., p. 794.



his wrath.<sup>1</sup>

II Sam. 24 describes a burnt offering of David. <sup>h</sup>Pythian-Adams observes that "the king was moved to offer it not as a ritual formality by which God might be placated but as a 'sacrifice' which would express his own deep personal penitence."<sup>2</sup> Yet, considering that the chapter begins with a statement that "Again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel" and ends with the statement, "So the Lord heeded supplications for the land, and the plague was averted from Israel," it is evident that something took place that changed God's attitude from one of anger to one of peace with Israel. G. B. Gray is right in commenting, "In other words, the holy story that described the origin of the sanctuary on Zion and its ritual traced back that ritual to a sacrifice of propitiation."<sup>3</sup>

The propitiatory efficacy of the burnt offering was no doubt early connected with the idea of God smelling the fragrance as the offering was burnt.<sup>4</sup> It is clearly indicated

---

<sup>1</sup>W. J. <sup>h</sup>Pythian-Adams, The People and the Presence, A Study of the At-one-ment (London: Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 25.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 25-56.

<sup>3</sup>George Buchanan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Its Theory and Practice (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925), pp. 84-85.

<sup>4</sup>Even when anthropomorphic ideas were absent and the sacrifice was viewed as a gift which was appraised in terms of monetary value, the burnt offering was viewed as obtaining merit with God for that person on whose behalf it was offered. See Leon Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 92, where reference is made to fifth century B.C. Aramaic papyri regarding the views of the Jews at Yeb in Egypt.

that David felt that, by its fragrance, such an offering might propitiate the wrath of God. "If it is the Lord who has stirred you up against me, may he accept an offering" (I Sam. 26:19). So reads the Revised Standard Version, but a more literal translation of the Hebrew is: "If it is Yahweh that has incited you against me, let him smell (סָחַק) an offering." And the Septuagint literally reads at this point: "Let him smell your offering (ὁσφρανθεῖν θυσίας σου)." David does not express any sense of sin, repentance, or an awareness of uncleanness, and he is certainly not expressing any attitude of thankfulness. It is an act of propitiation. G. B. Gray well observes:

It matters little whether the words attributed to David were spoken by him, or were merely placed in his mouth by the popular story on which this early narrative rests. Their significance is this: that they are not a carefully stated theory, in which case they might represent the thought of an individual only; but that they allusively and unintentionally reveal a current mode of thought; and in this current popular thought the purpose of sacrifice was, by burning the flesh on the altar and causing the fumes to rise, to placate the anger of Yahweh.<sup>1</sup>

This idea of the sweet smell placating the wrath of God is also seen in Gen. 8:20-21:

Then Noah built an altar to the Lord, and took of every clean animal and of every clean bird, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And when the Lord smelled the pleasing odor (רֵיחַ נִחֻחַ), the Lord said in his heart, "I will never again curse the ground because of man, . . ."

This in Genesis, however, is the only pre-exilic instance of

---

<sup>1</sup>George B. Gray, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

the phrase,<sup>1</sup> and Gray,<sup>2</sup> Herrmann,<sup>3</sup> Delling,<sup>4</sup> and Stumpff<sup>5</sup> agree that the term, though still used by "P", became much weaker and indicated that when God smelled the pleasing or sweet odor, he accepted the sacrifice. Thus crude anthropomorphic ideas were avoided, but the idea that God thus accepted the sacrifice still indicated that the sacrifice assured the people that God had not rejected them and refused their sacrifice.

### 3. "P" Authors

The "P" authors and leaders not only weakened any anthropomorphic ideas, but set up such a system that sin was regarded more as incurring uncleanness than as undermining one's relationship with God. Nevertheless, the personal element is still present, and repeatedly in Leviticus 4, where the practice and result of the sin offering are discussed, the assurance given to the sinner is not that he shall be cleansed, but that "he shall be forgiven" (Lev. 4:26, 31, 35).

While the Hebrew term most frequently used to describe sin had the connotation of "miss," "miss the mark," or "miss the way,"<sup>6</sup> other terms were used that more vividly brought

---

<sup>1</sup>Royden Keith Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953), p. 129.

<sup>2</sup>George B. Gray, op. cit., pp. 80-81.

<sup>3</sup>Johannes Herrmann, TWNT, III, 305.

<sup>4</sup>Gerhard Delling, TWNT, V, 493.

<sup>5</sup>Albrecht Stumpff, TWNT, II, 808.

<sup>6</sup>Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic (hereafter abbreviated BDB) (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 306.



out the idea of sin as rebellion against God and hatred of God.<sup>1</sup> The personal relationship is perhaps pushed back, but it is never pushed out.

Even when the talk is of uncleanness and the word for sin has the root meaning of "miss the mark," the personal relationship between God and the sinner is never more clearly expressed than in Ps. 51, of post-exilic times.<sup>2</sup> Ps. 51:1-4a reads:

Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy steadfast love;  
according to thy abundant mercy blot out my trans-  
gressions.

Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity,  
and cleanse me from my sin!

For I know my transgressions,  
and my sin is ever before me.  
Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, (Literally:  
"in relation to thee only have I missed the mark.")

One reason "P" uses  $\aleph \Delta \pi$  so often for sin with its secular associations of missing the mark, rather than a more active term, such as  $\cup \cup \supset$ , with the thought of rebellion against God, is that the sacrifices were designed to restore a relationship where the violation was primarily one of ignorance.<sup>3</sup> For presumptuous sins the sacrificial system offered

---

<sup>1</sup>Gottfried Quell, in Sin, by Gottfried Quell, Georg Bertram, Gustav Stählin, and Walter Grundmann, translated from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament with additions by J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951), pp. 1-21.

<sup>2</sup>W. O. E. Oesterly, The Psalms, Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes (London: SPCK, 1953), p. 271.

<sup>3</sup>Lev. 4 and 5 make very clear that only sins of ignorance are atoned for by the sin and guilt offering, yet Lev. 6:1-7 seems to present certain border-line cases.

no balm (Num. 15:30 ff.).

The sacrificial system was subjected to abuse, and against this abuse the prophets spoke out in sharp tones. Yet with the possible exception of Jeremiah,<sup>1</sup> it was not the use of sacrifices but the abuse of sacrifices that aroused the ire of the prophets.<sup>2</sup>

#### 4. Vicarious Nature

The vicarious aspect of sacrifice is set forth in Lev. 1:4 as it prescribes the ritual for a man bringing an animal as a burnt offering: "He shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."

While not all scholars agree as to the way in which the animal substituted for the worshipper or as to whether or not the guilt of the worshipper was symbolically transferred to the animal, that such substitution and transference took place

---

<sup>1</sup>Pythian-Adams, op. cit., p. 72: "To sum up, in spite of all that has been said about Jeremiah as the great teacher of 'spiritual religion,' we can find in reality no evidence for this assertion, if it means a religion which dispenses with all material media." However, W. O. E. Oesterley, in Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, Their Origin, Purposes and Development (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937), p. 242, points out that Jer. 33:18, which seems to look forward to a restored and well attended sacrificial service, is a later addition to the work. And on p. 207: "It cannot be denied that Jeremiah did envisage and advocate the entire abolition of sacrifice; but he was the one and only prophet of which this can be truthfully said."

<sup>2</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley, in Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, concludes his study of the pre-exilic prophets' attitude toward sacrifice with these words: "... it was not sacrificial worship in itself that they condemned, but only its misuse in wrong directions."



in the Day of Atonement rites (Lev. 16:22) is evident, and there is nothing that forbids such an interpretation here. In any event there was an identity of the worshipper with the animal; the animal was killed and the worshipper lived.<sup>1</sup>

The vicarious aspects of sacrifice are also indicated in Lev. 17:11: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Westminster Study Edition of the Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments in the Authorized (King James) Version (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1948), in loc.: "The ceremony of the laying on of hands was prescribed for meal offerings or birds, probably because they were brought in the hands. This ceremony expressed the substitutionary idea in sacrifice. By laying one's hands upon the offering, a symbolical transfer to the animal of oneself and one's sins was envisaged."

W. F. Lofthouse, "Leviticus," pp. 196-212, in A Commentary on the Bible, edited by A. S. Peake, with supplement by A. J. Grieve (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948), p. 198, acknowledges the idea of substitution in Babylonia but feels the present case is rather a gift. Peake also interjects a comment against substitution that the manipulation of the blood, and not the slaughter, was the chief point.

William Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, the Fundamental Institutions, 3d ed. (London: A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1927). An excellent discussion is presented on pp. 421-423, and his position is summed up on p. 425: ". . . in ordinary burnt-offerings and sin-offerings the imposition of hands is not officially interpreted by the Law as a transference of sin to the victim, but rather has the same sense as in acts of blessing or consecration, where the idea no doubt is that the physical contact between the parties serves to identify them, but not specially to transfer guilt from the one to the other."

Nathaniel Micklem, "The Book of Leviticus, Introduction and Exegesis," in The Interpreter's Bible (hereafter abbreviated IB) (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), II, 12: "The offerer first identified himself with his gift: then when the blood spouted forth something final was done: the life that poured out from the body was made over to God."

<sup>2</sup>Oesterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, pp. 224-225, comments on this verse: "This must mean that the life of

## 5. Divine Initiative

One other point should be made regarding the sacrificial system of the Old Testament: it was a gift of God and not an invention of man. God in his graciousness had provided the sacrificial system for restoring a personal relationship with the individual or all of Israel when sin disturbed the relationship; that system preserved the holiness of God and manifested his mercy; it enabled God to be both just and justifying.

In all things regarding sacrifice and ritual, the Old Testament does not view the rite as an ingenious invention of Aaron or Moses, nor does it consider it as something recommended by someone who had found the procedure effective. Again and again, "The Lord said to Moses," and after that preface come the details of the plan of worship. When it was time to build the tabernacle (Ex. 25 ff.), the beginning is: "The Lord said to Moses, 'Speak to the people of Israel that they take for me an offering.'" The Book of Leviticus begins, "The Lord called Moses, and spoke to him from the tent of meeting, saying, . . ."

The promises, "and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him" (Lev. 1:4), "and he shall be forgiven" (Lev.

---

the victim, which is in the blood, is liberated in order to save the life of the sinner; it will be remembered how often it is said of the sinner: 'that soul shall be cut off': in the passage quoted it is the people collectively which is spoken of. A life is substituted for theirs. This idea is very crude; it does not seem to have belonged exclusively to post-exilic times; but it lies at the base of the Jewish doctrine of atonement."

4:26, 31, 35), and "the priest shall make atonement for him for his sin" (Lev. 5:6) are all placed in the mouth of God.

But though God in his grace had established the sacrificial system, in order for man to realize the promise of God that "it shall be forgiven him," the sacrifices had to be offered in abedience to the regulations given by God. Aaron's sons, <sup>N</sup> Nadab and Abihu, were smitten by the Lord because they did not sacrifice aright.<sup>1</sup> Malachi also tells the people that they have provoked the Lord to wrath because they have tried to deceive him with their sacrifices.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Malachi goes on to point out that not to sacrifice and tithe aright is to rob God and will draw down a curse from God.<sup>3</sup>

#### 6. Summation

Regarding the relationship of sacrifices in the Old Testament to propitiation, the following summation can be made.

1. In pre-exilic times various sacrifices had their propitiatory aspects. This was not only true of the guilt offering the Philistines made to propitiate God, but also of the vow offering and the burnt offering.

2. The "P" authors and leaders eliminated anthropomorphic ideas of God, such as "smelling a soothing smell," but the idea of sacrifice as cleansing from sin or uncleanness never ruled out the idea that it enabled the sin to be

---

<sup>1</sup>See Lev. 10:1-7 and Num. 3:1-4.

<sup>2</sup>Mal. 1:6-14. V. 14a: "Cursed be the cheat who has a male in his flock, and vows it, and yet sacrifices to the Lord what is blemished."

<sup>3</sup>Mal. 3:8-9.



forgiven, that it made atonement. Even when uncleanness is used as a parallel term for sin, the Psalmist is aware that his greatest need is for God to forgive and restore the relationship.

The "P" authors also developed the idea of vicarious sacrifices. And with the possible exception of Jeremiah, the prophets had no desire to do away with sacrifices as a means of worship when properly used.

3. But the "P" authors made a great contribution by showing that the sacrificial system used by the Hebrews was not something designed by man to placate God (cf. I Sam. 6, where the priests and diviners devise their own system), but it was a system understood as having been established by God himself to restore broken and strained relationships within the community of his elect. The system was to impress upon the people both the tragic nature of sin and the holiness and grace of God. Not only the establishment of the system but the promise of forgiveness came from God.

Yet God's wrath could be provoked by deceitful sacrifices or unacceptable methods of offering a sacrifice. Upon those who flouted God's grace by refusing to avail themselves of the means of grace, came the wrath of God.

God established the system and offered forgiveness, but for man to receive of this bounty, he must provide the necessary sacrifice, identify himself with it, and usually give it to the priest. Then the priest performed the necessary rite on behalf of the worshipper.

When offered in obedience to the divine regulations, the sacrifice did make atonement, cleanse from sin, and enable the offerer to be forgiven regarding sins that were not presumptuous. The offering maintained or restored the personal relationship with God and the community. While appease is a hard word, there can be no doubt that the sacrificial system was propitiatory in that it conciliated God and man. The object was often not so much to establish,<sup>1</sup> as to maintain favorable relations with God since disdain and neglect of sacrifices were felt to provoke the wrath of God.

#### C. ἱλάσκεσθαι and Related Words

ἱλαστήριον and ἱλασμός, which are the Greek words rendered with "propitiation" in the Authorized Version in Romans and I. John, are members of a group of Greek words that may be designated the ἱλάσκεσθαι family or group, even though ἱλάσκεσθαι itself does not appear nearly so often in the Septuagint as the more intensive form of the word, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι.

The method of investigation will be to take each member of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group in turn and see what usage it bears in the Septuagint, first considering non-cultic instances and then cultic usage. If the Hebrew term in the Hebrew Text parallel to the Greek term under consideration sheds light on the inquiry, naturally it will also be investigated. In the case of  $\text{רָצַח}$ , the Hebrew is very

---

<sup>1</sup>Though it had this purpose on occasion. See pp. 3-7.

important. If other Greek versions of the Old Testament vary from the Septuagint at any point of importance, that will also be considered in determining the usage of the Greek word in the Old Testament.

Since various members of the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group appear over 200 times in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, only the more pertinent instances will be discussed. Appendix I gives a full correlation of all members of the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group with correlative Hebrew terms in the Septuagint and Apocrypha. Appendix II gives a correlation of various important Hebrew terms with the Greek term used to render them in the Septuagint. Appendix III, moreover, indicates where the Greek version of either Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion has inserted a *ἐλάσκεσθαι* word where the Septuagint had none or omitted one which was included in the Septuagint.

### 1. *Ἐξελάσκεσθαι*

*Ἐξελάσκεσθαι* appears 105 times in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. In that portion of the Septuagint which translates canonical works, *ἐξελάσκεσθαι* appears 95 times.<sup>1</sup>

Of these 95 instances, it is evident that the Greek term is an attempt to translate a Hebrew term 93 times.<sup>2</sup> And of

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix I, Section A. Note also TET, LXII, 230.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix I, Section A. In Num. 29:11 *ἐξελάσασθαι* is inserted into the LXX, and there is no Hebrew basis for it. In I. Sam. 8:3, though E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, in A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books), 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897), in *loc.*, list *ἐξελάσασθαι* with a question mark as the corresponding Hebrew term, Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 88, is surely right in denying any correspondence between the LXX and the MT at this point and saying: "Either



these 93 times where a Hebrew term underlies the Greek, in 83 or 84<sup>1</sup> instances that Hebrew term is a form of  $\text{רָצַח}$ , which itself appears only 100 times in the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup>

Thus it is seen that not only is  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  a word of frequent occurrence in the Septuagint, but also that it is very closely associated with  $\text{רָצַח}$ . It is with a consideration of  $\text{רָצַח}$  that the study of  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  begins.

### a. $\text{רָצַח}$

The root meaning of  $\text{רָצַח}$  is not certain though it is probable that it was "to cover."<sup>3</sup> The etymology of the verb,

---

the translators are paraphrasing rather than translating or they had a different text."

<sup>1</sup>J. Hermann, in TWNT, III, 302, line 6 ff., indicates  $\text{רָצַח}$  appears 100 times in MT and is translated 83 times with  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ .

Leon Morris, "The Use of  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ," p. 230, and also on p. 231, indicates  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  renders  $\text{רָצַח}$  83 times.

Yet Hatch and Redpath's Concordance, which is followed at this point in Appendix I, Section A, indicates 83 times plus Eze. 43:20, at which point  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  is given as the LXX rendering of both  $\text{רָצַח}$  and  $\text{נָחַץ}$ . Since  $\text{רָצַח}$  is rendered only 4 times plus this instance in Eze. 43:20, and since Morris, "The Use of  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ," p. 321, indicates  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  renders  $\text{נָחַץ}$  5 times, it is clear that he does not consider  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  as rendering  $\text{רָצַח}$  at Eze. 43:20.

<sup>2</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 302, line 6 ff., indicates  $\text{רָצַח}$  as a verb appears 100 times in the Old Testament. Appendix II, Section D, indicates 101 instances. Probably Herrmann has rightly not considered Is. 28:18 a valid instance. BDB, in loc., suggest the reading of the Targum is preferred to the MT in this instance. It is included in Appendix II, Section D, subsection II, for the sake of completeness with an appropriate footnote.

<sup>3</sup>BDB, in loc., indicates "cover" is to be preferred to "wash away, rub off."

Ludwig Koehler, in Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, by Ludwig Koehler and W. Baumgartner (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), in loc., also prefers "cover" to "wipe off," which is suggested by the Akkadian.

For more detailed study see: Ed. König, "The Hebrew Word

which appears for the most part in the piel, is also a matter on which scholars are not united, but if not a denominative<sup>1</sup> of the noun כֶּפֶר,<sup>2</sup> which has the usage "price of life" or "ransom," the verb כָּפַר is closely related to the noun כֶּפֶר.<sup>3</sup> A difference in the usage of כָּפַר and כָּפַר is that כָּפַר is primarily used in a secular or non-cultic manner,<sup>4</sup> while כָּפַר appears in a majority of instances in a cultic setting with a technical usage.<sup>5</sup> An examination of the non-cultic instances of the word will provide the clear-

---

for 'Atone,' TET, XXII, 232-234; Stephen H. Langdon, "The Hebrew Word for 'Atone,'" TET, XXII, 320-325; C. F. Burney, "The Hebrew Word for 'Atone,'" TET, XXII, 325-327; C. B. Gray, op. cit., pp. 67-73; Johann Jakob Stamm, Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament (Bern: A Francke AG, 1940), p. 61 f.

<sup>1</sup>E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, Second English edition revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition (1909), by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 141, paragraph 52h, points out that denominatives are frequently formed in this conjugation.

<sup>2</sup>BDB, in loc., treat כָּפַר as the denominative of כֶּפֶר.

See also Otto Procksch, Theologie des alten Testaments (Güttersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1950), p. 558: "Das Nomen (kōper) wird merkwürdigerweise nicht im sakralen, sondern nur im profanen Sinne gebraucht, das verbum (kipper), nach Ausweis der Pi'el form davon abgeleitet, gehört überwiegend dem sakralen Sprachgebrauch an."

Against this view is J. J. Stamm, op. cit., pp. 61-66.

Leon Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 85, maintains the verb is a denominative from כָּפַר.

<sup>3</sup>J. Hermann, TWNT, III, 303, lines 9-10, "Mit Recht wird von vielen Forschern eine enge Beziehung von כָּפַר zu כֶּפֶר angenommen."

<sup>4</sup>This is confirmed by an examination of the instances of the word as listed in Appendix II, Section A. J. Herrmann, TWNT, III, 303, lines 10-13, and Otto Procksch, op. cit., p. 558, also note this fact.

<sup>5</sup>Ludwig Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, in Neue Theologische Grundrisse. Herausgegeben von Rudolf Bultmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936), pp. 201-202.

Otto Procksch, op. cit., p. 558.



est understanding of the basic usage of the word,<sup>1</sup> however, and it is with non-cultic instances that the study will begin.

### (1) Oldest Instances

Köhler mentions Gen. 32:21 and Ex. 32:30, both in the Elohist or "E" source, as the two oldest instances of the word.<sup>2</sup>

In Gen. 32:21 the verb is used to express the action of one man, Jacob, towards another man, Esau. Jacob fears Esau (Gen. 32:11), and verse 21 comes to explain the motive of Jacob in sending all the gifts to Esau that are described in verses 13-19. The Revised Standard Version reads: "For he (Jacob) thought, 'I may appease (HT: פָּתַח בְּנֵי, LXX: ἑξασκοναί) him with the present that goes before me, and afterwards I shall see his face; perhaps he will accept me.'" This instance shows that by the time of "E", since Jacob hopes that by "appeasing" Esau he will be able to see Esau's

---

<sup>1</sup>This position is maintained by Leon Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," pp. 84-85; S. H. Langdon, "The Hebrew Word for 'Atone,'" TET, p. 323, and it is the method followed by J. Herrmann, TWNT, III, 302-311.

Dodd is very clear to distinguish religious and secular usage and tends to disparage any transference of usage when he comments on Gen. 32:20 and Prov. 16:14: "This use therefore does not strictly belong to our present subject since ἑξασκεταί is not here a religious term," in The Bible and the Greeks, p. 92. (This is a re-publication of "ἑξασκεταί, Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms in the Septuagint," pp. 352-360 in The Journal of Theological Studies (hereafter abbreviated JTS), XXXII, 358.)

Gustav Wiencke, Paulus über Jesu Tod, Die Deutung des Todes Jesu und ihre Herkunft (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939), p. 54, maintains that the cultic sense, extending itself over three-fourths of the occurrences, is decisive for the meaning of the word. Thus Wiencke stands opposed in methodology to Morris, Herrmann, and Langdon.

<sup>2</sup>Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 202.



face,  $\text{רָצַן}$  was already taken not in any literal sense of "to cover" but in a metaphorical sense of to make friendly, reconcile, appease, or propitiate.<sup>1</sup> That the sense of the verb, in both Hebrew and Greek, is to placate, propitiate, appease, or reconcile, is the consensus of most scholars, even those that maintain  $\text{רָצַן}$  and  $\text{ἱλάσκεισθαι}$  have such usage very seldom.<sup>2</sup>

It is interesting that  $\text{רָצַן}$ , in one of its oldest occurrences in the Old Testament, bears a usage so similar to the usually accepted usage of  $\text{ἱλάσκεισθαι}$  or  $\text{ἐξιλάσκεισθαι}$  in classical and common Greek, i.e., "placate," "propitiate," with a personal object.<sup>3</sup> While it is improbable that the author of "E" was acquainted with Greek, the translators of the Septuagint were able to use  $\text{ἐξιλάσκεισθαι}$  in its ordinary Greek sense to render faithfully the sense of  $\text{רָצַן}$ . If  $\text{רָצַן}$  is found in later writings with the usage of "appease" there is no reason for necessarily assuming a developed Hellenized usage of the word. The author may be going back to this old

<sup>1</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 304, lines 8-10.

<sup>2</sup>Gustav Wiencke, op. cit., p. 54, points out that in profane usage  $\text{רָצַן}$  means in only two places the propitiation of a man (Gen. 32:21, Prov. 16:16) and that in these places the purpose is to avoid destruction.

C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 92, lists Gen. 32:21 and Prov. 16:16 as the only two instances in which  $\text{ἐξιλάσκεισθαι}$  has the meaning of appease when it renders  $\text{רָצַן}$ .

Hermann Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, 3d English edition translated from the German of the 2d edition by W. Urwick (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880) (hereafter abbreviated BTL), p. 302, considers only Gen. 32:21 and Zech. 7:2 with the usage "appease" or "implore" answer to the construction in classical Greek.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 82.

usage of  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$  where there is no question of the entrance of Hellenistic thought into the mind of the author.

In Ex. 32:30, the other very old instance of  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$ , and also in "E", Moses says to the people: "You have sinned a great sin. And now I will go up to the Lord; perhaps I can make atonement (HT:  $\text{כִּפֵּרְכֶם}$ ; LXX:  $\text{\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\iota}$ ) for your sin."

Leon Morris stresses the relationship of  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$  and  $\text{כֹּפֶר}$  and the substitutionary element in Moses' attempt to make atonement when he comments:

There are other passages where the  $\text{כֹּפֶר}$  is not money, but life. Thus in Ex. XXXII, 30, Moses says "Now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin," but when he pleads with the Lord his method of "making atonement" is by offering his own life for theirs, as we see from v. 32.<sup>1</sup>

Herrmann, Wiencke, Noth, and the Westminster Study Bible also take the view that Moses tries to make atonement by the substitution of his life for the people.<sup>2</sup> Now in Gen. 32:21 the various gifts do serve as a  $\text{כֹּפֶר}$  for Jacob's life and substitute for it, but in this case, Moses does not say that he wishes to die rather than see the people die. Rather v. 32 makes it evident that if the people are to die for their sin, Moses wishes to die with them. Here Moses is trying to effect atonement by intercessory prayer and not by substitution.

---

<sup>1</sup>Leon Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 304, lines 27-30 and 44-45.

Gustav Wiencke, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948), f.n. 413.

The Westminster Study Bible, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

Köhler, Driver, Gressmann, Briggs, and Stamm all tend to support this position.<sup>1</sup> Moses' prayer conveys the idea of his sense of solidarity with the people rather than a desire to substitute for them.

Moses offers no gift, no sacrifice, nothing to propitiate God other than his prayer. As Köhler<sup>2</sup> observes, however, it is common to both these early passages that the verb is concerned with the changing of the temper and mood of the one propitiated, not about some impersonal, cold expiation.

In both instances the purpose of the act is not to expiate quantitatively the exact penalty of the wrong, but to effect forgiveness, to cause the person to forgive, whether it is Esau or God. In each instance the alternative to such forgiveness is destruction, in the one case destruction of Jacob and in the other, destruction of all Israelites. Such an act, whether it consist in the offering of gifts or a sincere prayer, can be described as an act of propitiation.

Moreover, here as in other canonical Septuagint instances of its usage,<sup>3</sup> the verb is not followed by an accusative of

---

<sup>1</sup>Ludwig Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, in Neue Theologische Grundrisse, Herausgegeben von Rudolf Bultmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936), p. 202.

S. R. Driver, "Propitiation," pp. 128-132 in DBI, IV, 129.

Hugo Gressmann, Mose und seine Zeit (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), p. 203.

Briggs in BDB, p. 497; Stamm, op. cit., p. 60.

<sup>2</sup>Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 202.

<sup>3</sup>Leon Morris, "The Use of ἐλάσκειν," p. 231, writes regarding ἐξελάσκειν: "Since it is sometimes said that this verb is often used in the sense 'to expiate' it is worth noticing that it is never followed by an accusative of sin in the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament."



sin. Thus Moses does not atone the sin, nor does he expiate the sin, but he makes atonement for or concerning (HT:  $\overline{\text{ט}}\overline{\text{ו}}\overline{\text{כ}}\overline{\text{פ}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{ה}}$ ; LXX:  $\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}$ ) the sin.

## (2) God as the Subject

$\overline{\text{כ}}\overline{\text{פ}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{ה}}$  is used several times with God as the subject of the verb and is frequently taken in these instances to have the usage of "forgive."<sup>1</sup> But when God forgives a man or a group of men, that is also an instance of his acting propitiously towards that man or nation.

In Ezekiel 16, God tells the people that they shall know that he is the Lord, "That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified (HT:  $\overline{\text{כ}}\overline{\text{פ}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{ה}}$ ; LXX:  $\xi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ; RSV: "when I forgive you") toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God." (AV)

Even as the Authorized Version and the Revised Standard Version use "when I am pacified" and "when I forgive" to translate this same phrase, Driver and Briggs<sup>2</sup> indicate the nearness of usage between acting propitiously towards someone and forgiving that person.

---

<sup>1</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 304, lines 33-42, lists occurrences in Jer. 18:23; Ps. 78:38; Ps. 65:4; and indicates as probable Is. 22:14 and Eze. 16:63.

J. J. Stamm, op. cit., p. 59, endorses this list and adds to it Ps. 79:9 and II Ch. 30:18.

<sup>2</sup>S. R. Driver, "Propitiation," DBT, IV, 129: "Ezk. 16:63 ('when I "cover" thee (i.e., act propitiously towards thee; . . .)')."

Briggs, in DBD, p. 797: "cover, i.e., treat as covered, view propitiously."

The difference in this situation and in many pagan situations dealing with a propitious act of the deity is that in Ezekiel 16, this propitious action stems from the unmerited grace of God. Israel has sinned and will be punished (Eze. 16:58-59), but God in his mercy will remember his covenant (v. 60) and will establish his covenant (v. 62).

רַחֵם is again rendered "forgive" by the Revised Standard Version in Jer. 18:23, when Jeremiah complains concerning his enemies:

Forgive not (HT: רַחֵם-לֹא; LXX: μὴ ἀθωώσης)  
their iniquity, nor blot out their sin from thy sight,  
Let them be overthrown before thee;  
deal with them in the time of thine anger.

According to Jeremiah, God is never indifferent, and if he does not forgive these evil men, he will destroy them in his anger. In other words, God forgiving them is also God dealing propitiously with them. The propitious attitude, though, is not being sought by these wicked men, but Jeremiah is afraid that God will be gracious anyway. The initiative is clearly with God in this gracious act that Jeremiah is afraid will take place. In this instance רַחֵם is not rendered by ἐξιλάσκεισθαι.

In the other instances where Herrmann or Stamm feels the usage of רַחֵם is "to forgive," in Is. 22:14 the Hebrew is rendered by ἀφεθήσεται; in Ps. 65:3 (65:4 MT, 64:4 LXX), 78:38, 79:9 the less intensive form ἱλάσκεισθαι is used, and only in II Chr. 30:18<sup>1</sup> is ἐξιλάσκεισθαι used.

<sup>1</sup>This instance is indicated by Stamm, *op. cit.*, p. 59, as a place where the usage is "to forgive" but not in the tabulation of Herrmann.

In II Chr. 30:18 the word appears in the climax of an episode connected with the beginning of Hezekiah's reign. Hezekiah is aware that the people have sinned (II Chr. 29:6f.), and that they are under the wrath of God (II Chr. 29:8f.). The purpose of his new covenant with the Lord is "that his fierce anger may turn away from us" (II Chr. 29:10).<sup>1</sup> The propitiatory motive could not be more clearly stated. However, some of the people that had not cleansed themselves ate of the passover (II Chr. 30:18), and Hezekiah prayed, "The good Lord pardon every one . . ." Here Hezekiah intercedes for the people as Moses had interceded in prayer before him (Ex. 32:30 ff.). "And the Lord heard Hezekiah, and healed the people" (II Chr. 30:20). The very use of the word "healed" indicates that some people needed healing, and probably Hezekiah interpreted their sickness as another evidence of God's wrath. The intention of the verb here is that the Lord will heal, turn away the evidence of his wrath and be propitious to the people, regardless of what word is used to translate the Hebrew or the Greek.

In Ps. 65:3 the word is related to God's forgiveness, and again in Ps. 78:38, though in this instance the verse contrasts his forgiveness with destruction. In Ps. 79:9 the author is in a state of distress when he calls out, and the forgiveness of sins he seeks is parallel to a request for

---

<sup>1</sup>See further the comment of W. H. Bennett, The Books of Chronicles in The Expositor's Bible, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894), p. 429.



deliverance, i.e., for God to manifest a more propitious attitude towards the people. The Psalm is especially beautiful in that it asks for such forgiveness and deliverance, not for any merit in the people but "for thy name's sake!"

Thus when God is the subject, the usage of  $\text{כָּפַר}$  is frequently "to forgive." This forgiveness is characteristically viewed as coming from the free grace of God or is for his own name's sake. Yet such forgiveness is the alternative to God's wrath and destruction and involves his propitious dealing with the people. Too,  $\xi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  does not appear as the Septuagint rendering of  $\text{כָּפַר}$  in these instances with its usual frequency.<sup>1</sup>

### (3). The Priestly Writings

While the relationship of propitiation and the cultus have already been considered,<sup>2</sup> it is now desirable to consider the usage of  $\text{כָּפַר}$  and  $\xi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  in the priestly writings. And "priestly writings" include not only the Priestly Code ("P"), and the Holiness Code ("H"), but also Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Eze. 40-48.<sup>3</sup>

Though this body of literature is only a small part of the Old Testament, it contains 81 of the 100 instances of  $\text{כָּפַר}$  in the Old Testament.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Of the seven instances cited by Stamm where  $\text{כָּפַר}$  has the usage "to forgive,"  $\xi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  appears twice,  $\xi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  three times, and other Greek terms twice.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 2-14.

<sup>3</sup>A similar grouping is followed by Herrmann, TWNT, III, 304, lines 4-6.

<sup>4</sup> $\text{כָּפַר}$  occurs 68 times in "P," 4 times in "H," and 9 times in Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Eze. 40-48. See Appendix II, Section D, for a listing of the various instances of the verb  $\text{כָּפַר}$ .

While the majority of these 81 instances are connected with a sin, guilt, burnt or some other type of offering, there are several instances where the setting in the priestly writings is similar to some of the instances considered earlier. These five<sup>1</sup> instances form a bridge to connect the usage of the priestly with the non-priestly writings, and they also furnish a key to the understanding of the more technical instances of  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  in the priestly writings.

Ex. 30:11-16 is important not only in that it shows again the note of substitution in "P,"<sup>2</sup> but in that it presents  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  and  $\text{כִּפֹּרֶת}$  in close relationship one to another, both in position and in usage, and it also illuminates the relations of  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$ ,  $\lambdaύτρον$ , and  $\epsilonἰσφορά$ . The passage is:

<sup>11</sup>The Lord said to Moses, <sup>12</sup>"When you take the census of the people of Israel, then each shall give a ransom (HT:  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$ ; LXX:  $\lambdaύτρα$ ; Versions of A, S, and T:  $\epsilonἰσφορά$ ) for himself to the Lord when you number them. . . .<sup>15</sup>The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, than the half shekel, when you give the Lord's offering to make atonement (HT:  $\text{כִּפֹּרֶת}$ ; LXX:  $\epsilonἰσφοράσθαι$ ) for yourselves. <sup>16</sup>And you shall take the atonement (HT:  $\text{כִּפֹּרֶת}$ ; LXX:  $\epsilonἰσφορά$ ) money . . . so as to make atonement (Hebrew and Greek same as in v. 15) for yourselves.

With the word "atonement" occurring three times in the quoted passage, it is perhaps appropriate to note Driver's objection to the use of the word "atonement" to express the

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 30:15; Num. 31:50, 35:33; 25:13; 16:46-47.

<sup>2</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 311, lines 18-21, concludes his study of  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  thus: "Dass der Gedanke einer Substitution-- in welchem Umfange, muss dahin stehen--vorhanden gewesen ist, sollte nach dem Befund von  $\text{כִּפֹּרֶת}$  und ausserkultischem  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  nicht geleugnet werden."

Hebrew. He objects, first, because "atonement" meant "reconciliation" in 1611 A.D. Today it means "making amends or reparation," i.e., expiation. Secondly, even if it still had the usage of "reconciliation," Driver feels the usage of the Hebrew is "propitiation" rather than "reconciliation."<sup>1</sup>

It is quite clear that the act indicated by כִּפֶּה consists of bringing the כֶּפֶר, and in the Hebrew Text the כֶּפֶר is called the כֶּפֶר־מָנֶה money. Thus the close mutual relationship of the כֶּפֶר words is illustrated, especially of כֶּפֶר and כִּפֶּה.<sup>2</sup>

Since to take a census was regarded as infringing upon a divine prerogative,<sup>3</sup> it can be seen why danger was involved. Ex. 30:11 shows that the procedure for ransoming the lives of the people came from God himself, nevertheless "the tax is designated as a ransom to protect men from the wrath of God when a census is taken."<sup>4</sup> The act of making this ransom as a substitute for the lives of the men is designated by כִּפֶּה. Thus, though God is not the object of the verb, the propitiatory character of כִּפֶּה here is evident.

Commenting more specifically on the usage of כִּפֶּה in the legal terminology of Ezekiel and "P," Driver, as Morris,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>S. R. Driver, "Propitiation," pp. 128-132 in DBT, IV, 128.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 85, comments on כֶּפֶר here, "it has the meaning of a denominative from כֶּפֶר."

<sup>3</sup>G. W. Wade, "Numbers," pp. 213-230, PCB, p. 228.

<sup>4</sup>J. Coert Rylaarsdam, "The Book of Exodus, Introduction and Exegesis," pp. 831-1099 in The Interpreter's Bible (hereafter abbreviated IB), edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), I, 1055.

<sup>5</sup>Morris, "The Use of ἱλάσκεσθαι," p. 231. See supra, p. 21 f.



points out the object of the verb is not the sin, but the sinner or sinners:

Here the subject is the priest, the means usually a sacrifice, though occasionally it is some other act or offering, regarded as vindicating the holiness of the community in which Jehovah dwells, and hence as reinstating it in His favour: the object is never the sin, but (as commonly understood) the person (or thing) on whose behalf the propitiation is made, . . .<sup>1</sup>

When the priest is the subject, as Driver rightly implies, he acts as the representative of man or men, not of God.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Num. 8:19 points out that the Levites have been provided by God to substitute for the children of Israel in the work of the sanctuary, to prevent a plague and also to enable God to spare the lives of the first-born of all the people of Israel.<sup>3</sup>

The usage of  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  in Num. 31:50 is very similar to that described in Ex. 30:15.<sup>4</sup> Num. 31:49 states that the men have just been counted, and v. 50 follows by adding that the men have brought various articles of jewelry to make atonement (HT:  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$ ; LXX:  $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$ ) for themselves.<sup>5</sup> The jewelry is the  $\text{כִּפֹּר}$  that substitutes for the men and saves them from destruction in this instance.

Num. 35:31-33 indicates once more the close relationship

<sup>1</sup>Driver, "Propitiation," pp. 128-132 in DBT, IV, 130.

<sup>2</sup>Cremer, BTL, p. 303, also maintains this position.

Wiencke, op. cit., p. 55, on the other hand, maintains that when the priest comes forward as the subject of the verb, he does so as God's representative.

<sup>3</sup>See also Num. 8:14-19.

<sup>4</sup>Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 85: "A similar meaning is to be found in Num. 31:50, . . ."

Herrmann, TWNT, III, 306, lines 9-12.

<sup>5</sup>The scripture uses the first person plural in relating this incident.

between כִּפָּר and קָדַשׁ:<sup>1</sup> the fact that if a כִּפָּר is not available or acceptable, the result is death or destruction to the person or persons on whose behalf it would have been offered,<sup>2</sup> and that no expiation<sup>3</sup> is acceptable for murder except the blood of the murderer.<sup>4</sup>

Since the subject of the passive verb is "the land," "expiation" rather than "propitiation" is the best translation of both the Hebrew and the Greek. Yet since God dwells in the midst of the people,<sup>5</sup> if expiation is not made, a broken relationship and God's wrath will follow.

There is no thought of God's being bribed in the Septuagint where ἐξιλασθήσεται appears, even as there is no thought of the blood of the victim literally being covered when קָדַשׁ appears in the Hebrew Text. But both verbs indicate the performance of a rite by men in accordance with God's instructions that enables God to remain in fellowship with the people and to prevent the breaking of the relationship and the encountering of the wrath of God. This is the common bond between these two words with their different root meanings.

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>Num. 35:31 (RSV): "Moreover you shall accept no ransom (HT: כִּפָּר ; LXX: λύτρα) for the life of a murderer who is guilty of death; but he shall be put to death."

<sup>3</sup>"Expiation" (RSV) rather than "cleansed" (AV) more accurately conveys the idea of substitution connected with כִּפָּר and λύτρα and is much nearer the meaning of ἐξιλασθήσεται, which renders קָדַשׁ in the LXX.

<sup>4</sup>The process set forth to be followed in the case of unsolved murders is given in Deut. 21:1-9. A heifer is substituted for the murderer.

<sup>5</sup>Num. 35:34.

the Old Testament about man's propitiation of God and the clear evidence that God was in a state of wrath prior to the propitiatory act.

While  $\text{כִּפָּר}$  and  $\text{ἐξιλάσκεσθαι}$  do not appear in the story related in Num. 25:1-5(JE), vv. 3-4 indicate the people had sinned, provoked the wrath of God, and God himself had instructed Moses to slay the offenders "that the fierce anger of the Lord may turn away from Israel."

Num. 25:16-18 ("P") present another story, and do contain  $\text{כִּפָּר}$  and  $\text{ἐξιλάσκεσθαι}$ . C. H. Dodd has well said "the story is one of 'propitiation' in the crudest sense."<sup>1</sup> Herrmann, Morris, and Driver also view the story as one of clear, crude propitiation.<sup>2</sup>

Any attempt to rule out any concept of propitiation in "P" and to maintain the writings of "P" make God too impersonal surely come to naught in view of this passage. Not only does v. 8 imply Phinehas propitiated God and placated his

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 88. Dodd makes this comment while discussing Ps. 103:30. It is to be regretted that he never comments specifically in this work on the usage of  $\text{כִּפָּר}$  and  $\text{ἐξιλάσκεσθαι}$  in Num. 25:13.

<sup>2</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 306, lines 19-27.

Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 88: "There can hardly be serious doubt that here we have propitiation in the fullest sense, and that this propitiation is the turning away of wrath by the offering of a  $\text{כִּפָּר}$ ."

Morris, "The Use of  $\text{ἐξιλάσκεσθαι}$ ," p. 230.

Driver, "Propitiation," DBT, IV, 129.

If, as Wade, op. cit., p. 227, suggests, the story is told primarily to support the claim of the descendants of Zadok to the priesthood, and the story of Phinehas' act is by way of illustration, it indicates that perhaps it was a commonly accepted idea that certain acts could "turn away God's wrath."



wrath when it reports that the plague was stayed after Phinehas killed the man and woman, but vv. 10-13 elaborate this view and place it in the mouth of God himself:

<sup>10</sup>And the Lord said to Moses, <sup>11</sup>"Phinehas the son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest, has turned back my wrath from the people of Israel, in that he was jealous with my jealousy among them, so that I did not consume the people of Israel in my jealousy. <sup>12</sup>Therefore say, 'Behold I give to him my covenant of peace; <sup>13</sup>and it shall be to him, and to his descendants after him, the covenant of a perpetual priesthood, because he was jealous for his God, and made atonement (HT: ִקְרָבָה ; LXX: ἐξιλάσατο) for the people of Israel.'"

In Num. 16:35-50 the story of Korah is continued. The people murmured against Moses and Aaron because of the death of Korah and his followers (16:31-33). This murmuring provoked God's wrath (16:45); and Moses instructed Aaron to make atonement for the people (16:46), which he does (16:47), and "the plague was stopped" (16:48). In v. 46 Moses said to Aaron, "Take your censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and lay incense on it, and carry it quickly to the congregation, and make atonement (HT: ִקְרָבָה ; LXX: ἐξιλάσαι) for them, for wrath has gone forth from the Lord, the plague has begun."

Driver considers this an act of appeasement of God's anger by Aaron;<sup>1</sup> Herrmann considers it similar to the case of Phinehas,<sup>2</sup> and Morris observes that "such passages demonstrate that the word, even as used in the Septuagint, retained a

---

<sup>1</sup>Driver, "Propitiation," DBT, IV, 130 (speaking of the incense); "by which Aaron appeased Jehovah's anger, and arrested the plague, . . ."

<sup>2</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 306, lines 26-31.

certain association with the removal of anger."<sup>1</sup> Indeed, Morris' comment on this verse is a worthy comment with which to sum up the use of  $\aleph \beth \daleth$  in the priestly writings:

Thus, if we take the incident narrated in Nu. 16:41-50, we have a making of atonement which may be held to be a link between the cultic and the non-cultic usages. Here, the congregation has murmured against Moses and Aaron, and a plague has broken out as a consequence of the Lord's anger against the people (v. 46). The means of averting the wrath is Aaron's offering of incense (vv. 46-7), and such an action by a duly consecrated priest must surely be regarded as within the scope of the cultus. But it was not one of the prescribed offerings, being nothing other than an oblation made in time of grave emergency, for the specific purpose of turning away the anger of the Lord, and the affinities of this with a  $\aleph \beth \daleth$  - payment are obvious. If it be objected that there was no great money value in the offering of a small quantity of incense, so that the atonement obtained is out of all proportion to the price paid, the answer must be that the atonement is always out of all proportion to the price paid, even the case of the non-cultic atonements, as, for example, the half-shekel, or the payment to secure immunity when one's ox has gored a man. There is always an element of grace in atonement. But just as, notwithstanding this, we can appreciate the place of the  $\aleph \beth \daleth$  - payment in the non-cultic practice, so in the processes of the cultus we may recognize both the element of grace and the necessity for the worshipper to make his offering, if he would be forgiven his sin.<sup>2</sup>

#### b. $\aleph \beth \pi$

$\aleph \beth \pi$  in the piel form is rendered some six times by members of the  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  group of words, five times by  $\epsilon^{\circ}\xi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ,<sup>3</sup> and once the piel infinitive construct is rendered in the Septuagint by  $\epsilon^{\circ}\xi\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  in Eze. 43:23.

In II Chr. 29:24 the Revised Standard Version probably correctly renders the verb "made a sin offering,"<sup>4</sup> though

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Use of  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ," pp. 230-231.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 89.

<sup>3</sup>These instances are II Chr. 29:24; Eze. 43:22, 23; 43:18; and Eze. 43:20, in which case the LXX has represented  $\aleph \beth \daleth$  and  $\aleph \beth \pi$  both with one Greek word.

<sup>4</sup>This is the usage also preferred by BDB, in loc.

the rendering of the Authorized Version "made reconciliation" reproduces something of the air of propitiation and the desire to make reconciliation that pervades I Chr. 29 and 30. However the Hebrew and Greek are translated, that was the intention of the entire procedure.<sup>1</sup>

All the instances in Ezekiel deal with the purification of the altar. It is perhaps too much to say that "the  $\alpha\lambda\omega\pi$  passages seem to express much the same meaning as those where  $\alpha\lambda\omega$  is the Hebrew,"<sup>2</sup> yet Eze. 43:27 implies the reconciling motive of the preceding actions when it promises that when all is done, "I will accept you, says the Lord God."

c.  $\alpha\lambda\omega$

$\alpha\lambda\omega$ <sup>3</sup> is rendered in the Septuagint once with Ps. 106(LXX:105):30. C. H. Dodd comments:

The verb  $\alpha\lambda\omega$ ,  $\alpha\lambda\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ , which is extremely common in the Old Testament, is always rendered elsewhere by  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ,  $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . It is difficult to understand why the translators, who habitually, and very frequently, render  $\alpha\lambda\omega$  by words meaning "to pray," here and here alone substitute  $\epsilon\chi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ .<sup>4</sup>

It is believed the reason  $\epsilon\chi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  is used here to render the Hebrew is that the verse refers to the propitiating

<sup>1</sup>See supra, p. 24, for discussion of this verse.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Use of  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ," p. 231.

Herrmann, TWNT, III, 306, lines 35-41, makes it clear, however, that  $\alpha\lambda\omega$  has its own special meaning.

<sup>3</sup>RDB, in loc., give in addition to the usage "pray" also "intervene," "interpose," and "intercede." Moses' prayer (Ex. 32:30 f.) is an example of prayer that is also propitiation.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 87. However, the use of the word "always" by Dodd is an exaggeration since in Gen. 48:11 and Eze. 16:52 neither of these Greek words is used to render  $\alpha\lambda\omega$ .



act of Phinehas,<sup>1</sup> and the translator was more interested in giving the correct connotation of the incident than in uniformity of terminology.

Field indicates that in one version ἐξιλάσατο is replaced by δέστειλεν and that in another version it is replaced by ἐξευμενίσατο.<sup>2</sup> While δέστειλεν has the primary usage of "put asunder," it can also mean "pay" or "render,"<sup>3</sup> and the latent thought of offering a 𐤒𐤓𐤕 is possibly present. Regarding ἐξευμενίσατο, the only usage attributed to it by Liddell and Scott is "propitiate."<sup>4</sup>

a. 𐤒𐤓𐤕

𐤒𐤓𐤕 appears 16 times in the Old Testament, only in the piel, with the usage of "mollify," "appease," "entreat the favour of." In 13 of these 16 instances the object of the verb is God, including the three instances, Zech. 7:2; 8:22, and Mal. 1:9, in which it is rendered by ἐξιλάσκεσθαι.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 87-88, himself regards the story of Phinehas as "one of 'propitiation' in the crudest sense." See discussion of the incident, supra, pp. 30-31.

<sup>2</sup>F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta; post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam Versione Syro-Hexapla concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit, (Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875), 2 vols., II, 262, in loc.

<sup>3</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (hereafter abbreviated LSGL). A new edition revised and augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 412-413, in loc.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 592, in loc.

<sup>5</sup>BDB, p. 318. See also Appendix II, Section E, where each instance of 𐤒𐤓𐤕, along with the Greek term used to render it in the LXX and the object of the verb are tabulated.

Dodd, who contends against the idea of propitiation being present in ἐξιλάσκεσθαι and its cognates in general,<sup>1</sup> states that "In these three passages, then, we meet for the first time with unmistakable examples of the ordinary classical and Hellenistic sense of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι = 'to propitiate.'<sup>2</sup>

Zech. 7:2 reads, "Now the people of Bethel had sent Sharezer and Regem-melech and their men, to entreat the favor of the Lord."<sup>3</sup> Dodd minimizes the force of this instance, maintaining that a tone of contempt pervades the passage.<sup>4</sup> Yet even should Zechariah have disapproved their motives, it shows a candid view of the normal thinking of the Jewish people. Moreover, Zechariah does not deny that they have cause to propitiate God, but rather he questions the sincerity of their feasts and fasts.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 82-93.

<sup>2</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, edited by James Moffatt (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1946), pp. 25-26.

C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, edited by James Moffatt (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1949), pp. 54-55.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 86. Dodd further points out (p. 87) that the usual rendering of the Hebrew "is δεῦσθαι" (ten times). While δεῦσθαι is the usual rendering, it renders the Hebrew only nine times in the LXX; Dodd is apparently using Theodotion's version of the Old Testament rather than the LXX for his compilation. In any event, it should be noted (see Appendix II, Section D) that the second most frequent rendering of πῦπ is ἐξιλάσκεσθαι.

So also Morris, "The Use of ἱλάσκεσθαι," p. 231: "the three πῦπ passages all express the sense of propitiation."

<sup>4</sup>Cremer, in BTL, p. 302, considers this passage with Gen. 32:21, the two passages in the LXX where the construction corresponds to classical Greek.

<sup>5</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 87.

This note of contempt which Dodd sees here is surely not present in every instance of πῦπ. See passages listed in Appendix II, Section D.

In Zech. 8:22, Zechariah himself is the speaker, and the propitiation of God is attributed to pagan people,<sup>1</sup> who, seeing the bliss of the Israelites, would also want to worship and be conciliated with the God of the Jews.<sup>2</sup> Of interest in establishing the close relationship of δέομαι and ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, at least in the mind of the translator of Zechariah, is the fact that δεηθῆναι is used in Zech. 8:21 to translate פלפול and ἐξιλάσκεσθαι is used in Zech. 8:22 also to translate פלפול, the same form in fact except that it is preceded by a ו .

Mal. 1:9a reads: "And now entreat (HT: נַחֲ-וֹלַן; LXX: ἐξιλάσκεσθε) the favor of God, that he may be gracious to us." While Dodd probably rightly considers the prophet to be speaking in an ironical manner,<sup>3</sup> this is not the view of all scholars.<sup>4</sup> In any event Malachi is not contemptuous towards sincere attempts accompanied by worthy

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, in The Bible and the Greeks, p. 87, indicates that pagan peoples are the subject of the verb "may have influenced the translators in allowing the ordinary pagan sense of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι to appear. The use is in any case clearly exceptional."

<sup>2</sup>Hinckley G. Mitchell, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai and Zechariah, in The International Critical Commentary (hereafter abbreviated ICC) (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912). See p. 215 for the development of this view.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 87.

So also by John Merlin Powis Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Malachi, in the ICC, p. 28, takes it as "an ironical suggestion."

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 28: "It is taken as a genuine call to repentance by Hi., We., Now., et al." Hi. refers to Ferd. Hitzig, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, ed., Steiner (1881); We. refers to J. Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten, ed. 3 (1898); Now. refers to W. Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten (Handkommentar), 2d Ed., (1903).



sacrifices to entreat the favor of God (Mal. 3:6-12). His point is that sacrifices designed to propitiate God should be accompanied by upright living (Mal. 2:10-16).

All three of these instances indicate that in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., ἐξιλάσκεσθαι could be used to translate שָׁלַח with the sense of "propitiate" and as a parallel rendering of שָׁלַח with δέομαι in one paragraph.

## 2. ἑξιλασις

The feminine noun, ἑξιλασις, appears in some manuscripts of the Septuagint at Hab. 3:17, but it is without any support from the Hebrew Text and is omitted by Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint and by the best manuscripts.<sup>1</sup>

The only definite instance of ἑξιλασις in the Septuagint is in Num. 29:11, where it is used to render פִּרְיָצָה in a cultic passage dealing with the sin offering. And from this one instance nothing can be told of the usage of ἑξιλασις or פִּרְיָצָה except that they are related to the sin offering.

However, since פִּרְיָצָה appears eight times in the Old Testament and appears also as the Hebrew term behind καθαρισμοῦ, ἑξιλασμοῦ, and ἱλασμοῦ, it is well to consider its usage,<sup>2</sup> even though it sheds no light on the root meaning of רָצָה.<sup>3</sup> It appears three times simply as part of the term "day of atonement,"<sup>4</sup> three times in relation to the sin offering,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Alfred Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta*, Editio Quarta, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950), II, 537, in loc.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix II, Section B.

<sup>3</sup>Herrmann, *TWNT*, III, 302, line 40; p. 303, line 1.

<sup>4</sup>Lev. 23:27, 28; 25:9.

<sup>5</sup>Ex. 29:36; 30:10; Num. 29:11. See grouping of Driver, "Propitiation," *DBT*, IV, 130.

and once in relation to the guilt offering.<sup>1</sup>

In the eighth instance, Ex. 30:16,<sup>2</sup> "the atonement money (HT: מִן־הַכֶּסֶף הַזֶּה ; LXX: τὸ ἀργύριον τῆς εἰσφορᾶς)" clearly refers to the half-shekel which is also called a ransom (HT: כֶּסֶף ; LXX: λύτρα; Versions of Aq., Sm., and Th.: ἑξιλασμα) and serves to substitute for the lives of the people. When the meaning of the term is clear here, and when it is associated with the sin offering, guilt offering, or the day of atonement when a scapegoat was involved, it is right to assume that "מִן־הַכֶּסֶף is the covering of sin by means of sacrifice, expiation."<sup>3</sup> But it should be added, such covering also averts the wrath of God and serves as a ransom for him, and so מִן־הַכֶּסֶף has reference not only to cleansing but conciliation and propitiation.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Num. 5:8; Driver, "Propitiation," DBT, IV, 130.

<sup>2</sup>See discussion, supra, p. 26 f.

<sup>3</sup>Cremer, in BTL, p. 304.

<sup>4</sup>That both aspects, cleansing and reconciliation, may be present in the verb קָדַשׁ, Ex. 30:10 speaks for since קָדַשׁ occurring twice in the verse, is rendered once by ἑξιλάσεται and once by καθαρίεθ.

Also Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 83, comments on Ex. 30:10: "The phrase מִן־הַכֶּסֶף הַזֶּה תִּתְּנוּן becomes in B ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καθαρισμού, in A, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καθαρισμού-ἑξιλασμοῦ, where once again we may fairly suspect a conflate reading." Yet if A with the addition of ἑξιλασμοῦ is a conflate reading, it must have been a popular one since most manuscripts prefer it to the reading of B.

See Rahlfs, op. cit., in loc. Rahlfs gives the reading of Cod. A in his eclectic text.

See also Alan England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray (editors), The Old Testament in Greek, According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, supplemented from other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus, containing the variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint, 3 vols. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1907-1940), Vol. I, Part 2, p. 258, in loc.

Moreover, Field, op. cit., I, 138, in loc., points out that Aquila in his Greek version of the Old Testament replaced καθαρισμού with ἑξιλασμοῦ.

### 3. ἑξίλασμα

The neuter noun ἑξίλασμα<sup>1</sup> appears twice in the Septuagint, in I Sam. 12:3, and Ps. 49(LXX:48):7, and in both instances ἑξίλασμα is rendering קֶדָּוָה.<sup>2</sup>

I Sam. 12:3 is part of an address by Samuel and in part of the verse he says, "Or from whose hand have I taken a bribe (HT: קֶדָּוָה ; LXX:ἑξίλασμα)." <sup>3</sup> And in Ps. 49(LXX:48):7b the statement is that no man can "give to God the price (HT: קֶדָּוָה ; LXX:ἑξίλασμα) of his life."<sup>4</sup>

The idea of קֶדָּוָה representing a substitutionary gift which substitutes for a life is also seen in nearly every instance of its occurrence in the Old Testament. Moreover, in 11 of the 13 instances of קֶדָּוָה<sup>5</sup> for which the Septuagint presents a corresponding Greek term, λύτρον, which appears six

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix I, Section C.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix II, Section A. For a tabulation of how ἑξίλασμα in the versions of A, S, and T becomes more popular as a rendering of קֶדָּוָה than any other term, even λύτρον, see Appendix III, Section A, Part II.

<sup>3</sup>S. R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, 3d ed., in the ICC: "Kopher is an interesting word, which carries us deep down into the feeling and usage of the ancient Hebrews. It is the price or equivalent of a life: . . . I Sam. 12:3 (a bribe to screen a murderer: so Am. 5:12), . . ."

Herrmann, TWNT, III, 303, lines 33-35, is more cautious but admits this instance does not speak against the idea of "Sühngeld für verfallenes Leben."

<sup>4</sup>O. Prockach, TWNT, IV, 331, line 4: "freilich Ps. 48:8 auch für die Ablösung eines Menschenlebens begegnet; . . ."

LSGL, in loc., gives as the usage of ἑξίλασμα in these two instances in the LXX "ransom," "propitiatory offering."

Dodd, in The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 92-93, challenges the usage "propitiatory offering" but does not mention "ransom," yet the "bribe" in I Sam. 12:3 surely would have been offered to Samuel to make him more propitious, towards the criminal and thereby have ransomed the life of the malefactor.

<sup>5</sup>No Greek term corresponds to the Hebrew in Job 33:24 and 36:18.



times, ἀλλάγμα, which appears in Is. 43:3 and Cod. A of Amos 5:12, and ἀντάλλαγμα which occurs in Cod. B of Amos 5:12, all have the idea of exchange.<sup>1</sup> And περικάθαρμα, which appears once, has the idea of expiation.

Thus the idea of ransom, a substitute for a human life, is carried out in the Greek terms as well as in the Hebrew. And that ἐξίλασμα came to bear more and more this idea of substitution for life, even more than λύτρον,<sup>2</sup> is indicated by the fact that in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, ἐξίλασμα is used more often than λύτρον to render כִּפָּר .<sup>3</sup>

This study of כִּפָּר , with its close relationship with כִּפָּרָה , not only prepares one to view in כִּפָּר the doing of something that will substitute for the life of a human,<sup>4</sup> but also shows that while כִּפָּר was believed as early as the seventh century B.C. to be able to convey the idea of substitution, ransom, or bribe, by the second century A.D. the Greek translators of the Old Testament felt that ἐξίλασμα was pre-eminently the term with which to render כִּפָּר . Finally, the fact that the New Testament used members of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group in the century immediately preceding the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion is not to be overlooked.

<sup>1</sup>LSGL, in loc.

<sup>2</sup>For the close relationship of כִּפָּר and λύτρον see Procksch, TWNT, IV, 330-331, especially p. 330, lines 32-35.

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix III, Section A, Part II, and Appendix II, Section A.

<sup>4</sup>See Driver's discussion of כִּפָּר and כִּפָּרָה in A Commentary on Deuteronomy, 3d ed., ICC, pp. 425-426.

## 4. Ἐξίλασμός

Ἐξίλασμός is a masculine noun which appears eight times in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and the seven instances where it renders a Hebrew term are all in the priestly strand of the Old Testament literature.<sup>1</sup> The usage is similar to the feminine noun, ἑξίλασις;<sup>2</sup> קִרְבָּן is the corresponding term in four instances where the word is used in a cultic way in regard to either the altar of incense, the day of atonement, or the guilt offering.<sup>3</sup>

In Eze. 43:23 ἑξίλασμός is used in the Septuagint to render the piel infinitive construct of נָסַח, and both are used in a cultic sense.<sup>4</sup> In Eze. 45:19 ἑξίλασμός appears again in a cultic situation where the Hebrew text has the noun נִסְחָפִי that is rendered in the Revised Standard Version by "sin offering." There is no sense of placation, though the fact that it is to atone for sins of ignorance (45:20) might indicate it was to prevent God's wrath and to maintain

---

<sup>1</sup>"Priestly writings," as noted supra, p. 25, includes not only "P" material, but also Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and Eze. 40-48. These seven instances are Ex. 30:10; Lev. 23:27, 28; Num. 5:8; I Chr. 28:11; Eze. 43:23; and 45:19. The eighth instance, Eze. 7:25, Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., in loc., list קִרְבָּן as the correlative term with a question mark. This is listed according to Codex A; Codex B omits ἑξίλασμός in Ex. 30:10, and replaces ἑξίλασμός with ἑξίλασις in Num. 5:8.

<sup>2</sup>LSGL, in loc., gives the same usage for both nouns: "propitiation," "atonement."

<sup>3</sup>Ex. 30:10, altar of incense; Lev. 23:27, 28, day of atonement; Num. 5:8, guilt offering. I Chr. 28:11, where the word is used to render קִרְבָּן, will be considered later when ἑξίλασμός is discussed.

<sup>4</sup>See supra, p. 32f., for discussion of נָסַח and general comment on this chapter of Ezekiel.

a harmonious relationship with God.

The lone non-priestly occurrence is in Eze. 7:25, and in contrast to the instances in the priestly writings, which may or may not embody the idea of propitiation in the word, the idea of propitiation is evident. The Septuagint does not present a close translation of the Hebrew in this verse, and other Greek versions of the Old Testament use words more in keeping with the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> However, the theme of the verse, which is God's judgment upon and wrath against Israel (Eze. 7:1-4) together with the plain meaning of the words in the Septuagint, makes it clear that in this non-cultic instance, ἐξιλασμός has the usage of propitiation, propitiatory offering, or propitiatory acts. The fact that it represents an act attempting to seek peace and reconciliation with God is evident: "And propitiation (ἐξιλασμός) will be present, and one shall seek peace, yet it shall not be."

Thus ἐξιλασμός has a usage of propitiation in one instance, and in the cultic instances considered it is possible but not required.

### 5. ἱλάσκεσθαι

ἱλάσκεσθαι, in contrast to the frequency of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι,

---

<sup>1</sup>The word in the Hebrew that has the place in the verse of ἐξιλασμός in the LXX, שָׁטַח, is given the usage in BDB, in loc., of "shuddering." The RSV renders the Hebrew: "When anguish (שָׁטַח) comes, they will seek peace, but there shall be none." clearly on comparison with 1783

Field, op. cit., II, 786, in loc., indicates that Aquila and Theodotion replace ἐξιλασμός in their Greek versions of the Old Testament with συνοχή while Symmachus replaces ἐξιλασμός with ἀθυμία. Both συνοχή and ἀθυμία are better literal translations of the Hebrew than ἐξιλασμός.



appears only ten times in the Septuagint version of the canonical Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> And it is interesting that the less intensive form of the word does not render  $\text{רָצַח}$  in the majority of its occurrences. Appearing in a variety of constructions,<sup>2</sup> ἑλάσκεισθαι has as its underlying Hebrew  $\text{פָּלַח}$  six times,  $\text{רָצַח}$  three times, and  $\text{פָּרַח}$  once.<sup>3</sup>

#### a. $\text{פָּלַח}$

$\text{פָּלַח}$  is an important word, not only because it rests beneath ἑλάσκεισθαι six times in the Septuagint version of the canonical Old Testament and once more in Dan. 9:19 (Th.), but also because of its 33 instances in the qal, it is the Hebrew basis of ἔλεως with various helping verbs some 17

---

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 32:14; II Kings 5:18; 24:4; II Chr. 6:30 (ἑλάσκεισθαι does not appear in the major manuscripts but is included in Rahlfs' eclectic text in this instance); Ps. 25(LXX 24):11; 65(LXX 64):3; 78(LXX 77):38; 79(LXX 79):9; and Lam. 3:42. ἑλάσκεισθαι also appears in Dan. 9:19 in Theodotion's Version, and in the LXX of Est. 4:17h. However, the part of Esther contained in 4:17h does not appear in the canonical version of Esther or in the Hebrew Text.

<sup>2</sup>Every instance of ἑλάσκεισθαι with regard to both the grammatical and contextual setting in Morris, "The Use of ἑλάσκεισθαι," pp. 228-229, is listed.

For a listing of each instance with a correlation of Greek, Hebrew, and grammar, see Appendix II, Section E.

It appears absolutely in Ex. 32:15; II Kings 24:4; Lam. 3:42.

It appears with the dative of person in II Kings 5:18; 18; II Chr. 6:30.

It appears with the dative of sin in Ps. 25:11; 78:38; 79:9.

It appears with the accusative of sin in Ps. 65:3.

In Dan. 9:19 (Th.) it is used absolutely, and in Est. 4:17h, it appears with the dative of sin.

<sup>3</sup>The underlying Hebrew is  $\text{פָּלַח}$  in II Kings 5:18; 18; 24:4; II Chr. 6:30; Ps. 25:11; Lam. 3:42, and again for the instance in Dan. 9:19.

It is  $\text{רָצַח}$  in Ps. 65:3; 78:38; and 79:9.

$\text{פָּרַח}$  is the underlying Hebrew in Ex. 32:14.

times.<sup>1</sup> ἔλεως, while rather remote from ἔλασμος and ἔλαστήριον, is also a member of the ἐλάσκεσθαι group of words.<sup>2</sup>

πλδ can usually be rendered into English with "forgive" or "pardon,"<sup>3</sup> and occasionally the thought is implied strongly or even stated that such forgiveness is hoped for or God is said to forgive not because of any work or merit of man but because of his gracious nature. Dan. 9:18-19 illustrates this: "O my God, incline thy ear and hear; open thy eyes and behold our desolations, . . . for we do not present our supplications before thee on the ground of our righteousness, but on the ground of thy great mercy. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive (HT:  $\pi\lambda\delta$ ; Theodotion: ἐλάσθητι ); . . ." But as Morris has observed, the fact that the verb deals with forgiveness does not mean that thoughts of propitiation and divine anger are necessarily excluded. Both thoughts may well be present.<sup>4</sup> There is no doubt that Daniel 9 speaks also of God's wrath and feels the need for God's dealing more propitiously with Jerusalem. Dan. 9:16 reads: "O Lord, according to all thy righteous acts, let thy anger and thy

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix II, Section G, for a tabulation of all the instances of  $\pi\lambda\delta$  in both the qal and niphal.

<sup>2</sup>See F. Büchsel, TWNT, III, 300-301, for discussion.

See Appendix I, Section I, for a tabulation of all the instances of ἔλεως.

<sup>3</sup>BDB, in loc.

<sup>4</sup>Morris, "The Use of ἐλάσκεσθαι," p. 228: "It is argued by some that because these verbs convey thoughts like 'forgiveness,' there is no question of propitiation of the Divine anger. But the question is not so simple, for both may well be present."

wrath turn away from thy city Jerusalem, . . ."

The usage is similar in some ways to that of רַחֵם in Jer. 18:23,<sup>1</sup> where the thought of God's free forgiveness is expressed but where the only alternative is destruction and God's wrath.

When ἱλάσκεσθαι is used to render πῦρ in such situations, it represents a real change from any pagan usage where the men are viewed as placating or propitiating a deity. Yet, though the initiative in some instances and usually all worth-while causes for such propitiating action rest with God rather than men, the result is that God will be propitious, put aside his wrath--which is the clear alternative--and be gracious. The basis for the hope of God's favour is seen to rest with his gracious mercy and not some sacrifice or gift offered by men, but the end result is the same in pagan Greek and the Old Testament. God will be propitious and not wrathful.

This alternative of wrath when forgiveness is not forthcoming, is seen in nearly every instance of the usage of πῦρ in the qal, both where the Septuagint renders the Hebrew with ἱλάσκεσθαι or ἔλεως and also where some other verb, such as καθαριεῖ or εὐελατεῖσθαι, is used.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See supra, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>The clearest instance of God's mercy and forgiveness being presented without any contrasting thoughts of wrath is in Is. 55:7, and in this instance ἀφήσει renders the Hebrew. See further Morris, "The Use of ἱλάσκεσθαι," pp. 228-229, where Morris shows that every instance of ἱλάσκεσθαι appears in a contextual setting where the forgiveness is an



b. □□□

In Ex. 32:14 □□□ is the Hebrew that underlies *ἰλάσκεσθαι*.<sup>1</sup> With a usage of "be sorry," the Hebrew verb, while not having the usage of "propitiate" or "to be propitiated," implies in its very nature that the person who "is sorry" has had a change of heart and attitude.<sup>2</sup>

The fact that □□□ clearly indicates a repenting of God for his anger towards the Israelites, provoked by their molten calf, is illustrated in Ex. 32:11-14: "11 But Moses besought the Lord his God, and said, 'O Lord, why does thy wrath burn hot against thy people, . . . 12 . . . Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent (HT: □□□□□□□□□□ ; LXX: ἰλεως γενοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου, of this evil against thy people. 13 . . . 14 And the Lord repented (HT: □□□□□□□□□□ LXX: ἰλάσθη ) of the evil which he thought to do to his people."

In neither v. 12 nor v. 14 does the Septuagint exactly reproduce the Hebrew. In v. 12, the Septuagint, instead of asking God to repent of the evil towards the people, rather

---

alternative to wrath. And as regards a usage of "expiation" rather than "propitiation," in only one instance is it followed by the accusative of sin, and here a few manuscripts have a dative of sin (Ps. 65:3).

<sup>1</sup>The other instance where □□□ is the basis for a member of the *ἰλάσκεσθαι* group is in Ex. 32:12, where the LXX has ἰλεως γενοῦ

<sup>2</sup>Dodd rather narrowly defines the word in The Bible and the Greeks, p. 86, as "have compassion," for the niphal. BDB, in loc., gives a broader usage, which more easily presupposes propitiation having taken place: "be sorry," "rue," "suffer grief," "repent," and regarding Ex. 32:12 and 14, BDB adds "for ill done to others."

asks God to be merciful to the sin of the people, thus showing the close relationship between God's mercy towards sin and the avoidance of God's wrath.

In v. 14, *ἰλάσθη* in the passive voice<sup>1</sup> can be best rendered as it appears in the Septuagint: "And God was propitiated to preserve his people." While the Hebrew in both v. 12 and v. 14 has "repent of evil," in v. 12 the Septuagint has God showing mercy towards the sin, while in v. 14 the Septuagint expresses the same Hebrew verb with God as the subject of a passive verb and the people as the object: "And God was propitiated."<sup>2</sup> The thought of God's mercy and forgiveness of sin is present, but the thought of God's wrath, the avoiding of that wrath, and the statement that God was propitiated by Moses' prayer are also in this important passage.

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 91, comments on the passive form of the Greek: "The difference between middle and passive in the Greek does not represent any differences in the Hebrew translated; it is not accompanied by any difference in construction; nor does it convey any difference of meaning." It may not indicate any difference in the form of the Hebrew translated, but it would indicate the translator viewed the Hebrew verb in a particular way, depending on whether he placed it in the passive or middle. So C. F. D. Moule, in An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), p. 24 ff., writes regarding the voices that "the distinction has become blurred by the N.T. period," but there is a difference in blurred and eradicated. Moreover, Exodus was translated into Greek many years before the New Testament was written. In any event, the sense of the passage makes it plain that in this instance in any case, *ἰλάσκεσθαι* is to be taken in the passive sense.

<sup>2</sup>Cremer, in BTL, after pointing out on p. 301: "In Homer always, and in later Greek in the majority of cases, *ἰλάσκεσθαι* denotes a religious procedure: to make the gods propitious," comments on this passage on p. 304: "According to the Hebrew ( $\square\Pi$ ), it would seem that *ἰλ.* in this passage corresponded to the profane use."

## c. Summation

In summation of the usage of *ἱλάσκεσθαι* in the Septuagint, it often appears that the rendering of "forgive" or "pardon" is in order. Sometimes this pardon is sought or spoken of where the implication is that the only basis of such action is God's own graciousness. Yet wherever *ἱλάσκεσθαι* appears as the rendering of  $\pi\lambda\sigma$  or  $\pi\lambda\sigma$  or  $\pi\lambda\sigma$ , the idea of God's wrath looms in the immediate or remote background. While this represents a considerable development in *ἱλάσκεσθαι* from its general pagan usage, the idea of the avoidance of wrath is still evident. Such development of the use of *ἱλάσκεσθαι*, moreover, is by no means uniform, for in Ex. 32:14 *ἱλάσκεσθαι* appears in the Septuagint with the clear implication that God has been propitiated by the plea of Moses. It is not exactly right to speak of a "Hellenism" as not being completely "Hebraized" in this instance, however, for here  $\pi\lambda\sigma$ , as also has been determined for  $\pi\lambda\sigma$  in several instances, reveals the thought of propitiation as being evident in the Hebrew also.

## 6. ἱλασμός

*ἱλασμός* is of special importance since it appears in I John 2:2 and 4:10 and is the word around which the study of the Johannine doctrine of propitiation turns.

It appears seven times in various versions and manuscripts of the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> It appears in Lev. 25:9 and in Num.

<sup>1</sup>Lev. 25:9 and Num. 5:8 (Cod. B) for  $\pi\lambda\sigma$ ; Eze. 44:27 for  $\pi\lambda\sigma$ ; Am. 8:14 for  $\pi\lambda\sigma$ ; Ps. 130(LXX



5:8 in a cultic sense where the underlying Hebrew is  $\square \text{ר} \text{ז} \text{ז}$ . It appears in Eze. 44:27, again in a cultic sense, where the underlying Hebrew is  $\text{ת} \text{נ} \text{ז} \text{ז}$ . The main way in which these three instances advance the study of  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  is that they indicate it can be used in a way very similar to  $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ .<sup>2</sup> It appears once as an inaccurate rendering of  $\text{ז} \text{ח} \text{ז} \text{ז}$  in Amos 8:14.<sup>3</sup>

In I Chr. 28:20  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  appears in a part of the verse in the Septuagint that has no Hebrew counterpart. The addition reads: "And behold the pattern of the temple, even his house, and its treasury, and the upper chambers, and the inner storerooms, and the house of the means of propitiation ( $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\acute{o}\nu \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ ), and the plan of the house of the Lord."

Whether the Hebrew text has become lost for this part of v. 20 or whether the Greek is an addition is a moot point.<sup>4</sup>

29):4 and Dan.(Theodotion)9:9 for  $\text{ז} \text{ח} \text{ז} \text{ז}$ ; and with no underlying Hebrew term in I Chr. 28:20. See Appendix I, Section F, for the listing of  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ .

<sup>1</sup>In Num. 5:8, see supra, p. 41. Cod. A reads  $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ .

<sup>2</sup>This is indicated not only by the fact that different manuscripts use both  $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  for the same thing in Num. 5:8, but also that  $\text{ז} \text{ח} \text{ז} \text{ז}$  and  $\square \text{ר} \text{ז} \text{ז}$  are also both rendered into Greek where they appear in a cultic sense by  $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ . Moreover, in two of the three instances  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  appears in the apocryphal literature, some manuscripts of major importance have  $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  for an alternate reading.

<sup>3</sup>Whether  $\text{ז} \text{ח} \text{ז} \text{ז}$  is taken in the sense of "sin" (AV) or as a proper name "Ashimah" (RSV),  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  is not the best word with which to render it. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 84, rightly observes: "The translation is mistaken," and suggests "the translators seem to have been influenced by the close kinship of  $\text{ז} \text{ח} \text{ז} \text{ז}$  and  $\text{ז} \text{ח} \text{ז} \text{ז}$ ."

<sup>4</sup>Rahlfs, op. cit., in loc., relegates this part of the Greek text to the footnotes in his text, but cites no manuscript evidence to support his action.

But the language is almost a duplication of I Chr. 28:11, where καὶ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ἐξιλασμοῦ appears, and where ἐξιλασμοῦ has the underlying Hebrew of כִּפֹּרֶת.

This instance shows: (1) Another indication of the close relationship between ἐξιλασμός and ἱλασμός. (2) The indication that the thought of כִּפֹּרֶת was rendered by not only one but two words other than ἱλαστήριον or ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα. (3) In this one instance, ἱλασμός would not have the usage of "sin-offering" or "forgiveness." Also since כִּפֹּרֶת referred to the golden "mercy seat" that covered the ark and upon which blood was sprinkled, ἱλασμός would not have simply the usage of "atonement," and the definite article would reinforce the idea that something specific was in the mind of the author. Hence ἱλασμός has the usage in this instance of "the means of propitiation."<sup>1</sup>

In the other two instances of the use of ἱλασμός, it renders כִּפֹּרֶת in Ps. 130:4 and Dan. (Th.) 9:9.<sup>2</sup> Ps. 130:4

---

Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, op. cit., in loc., cite only the cursive manuscripts "m" and "d" as omitting ἱλασμός. It appears in both Cod. A and Cod. B.

W. A. L. Emslie, in "The First and Second Books of Chronicles, Introduction, Exegesis, and Exposition," pp. 341-548 in IB, III, 437, maintains the superiority of the LXX over the MT at this point, writing: "A summarizing sentence at the end of this verse has dropped out of the M.T. and is preserved in the LXX."

<sup>1</sup>To assume that ἱλασμός here has the usage of "mercy seat" is dangerous for several reasons. It should be sufficient to discount this suggestion to note: 1) No one is absolutely certain what Hebrew undergirded this part of I Chr., or whether it ever did. 2) In any event, this would be the only time ἱλασμός is used to render כִּפֹּרֶת.

<sup>2</sup>BDB, p. 699, in loc., give "forgiveness" as the only usage of the noun, though where the plural abstract intensive form occurs in Neh. 9:17 and Dan. 9:9, "abundant forgiveness" is given as the usage.

reads: "But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared (RSV and AV read the same)." As Morris notes, "We notice from the context that the Psalmist is in trouble,"<sup>1</sup> yet the entire emphasis is upon God's graciousness. The Psalmist is aware of his sin, v. 3, but vv. 7-8 reach a high point in the praise of God's unmerited goodness. The Authorized Version and the Revised Standard Version are right in rendering the Hebrew as "forgiveness." Granted that the alternative to God's forgiveness is distress, *ἐλασμός* is used to convey the thought of forgiveness. This forgiveness, moreover, is not an account of man's merit or even sacrifice but is "with Thee." This late<sup>2</sup> Psalm uses *ἐλασμός* in strong contrast to secular Greek.<sup>3</sup>

In Dan. 9 the author is aware of his sin (v. 5, 11), the wrath of God (v. 7, 11, 16), and clearly seeks the forgiveness of God (v. 16 f.). He is aware that part of the cause for the

As indicated by Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., in loc., and by Henry A. Redpath, A Supplement to a Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books), by E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1906), in loc., and as is confirmed by a comparison of the MT and LXX, the LXX version of Daniel has no term that corresponds to *ἐλασμός* in Dan. 9:9.

In Neh. 9:17 *ἐλασμός* is rendered in the LXX with *ἐλεῖμην*.

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Use of *ἐλάσκεσθαι*," p. 229. He is referring to v. 1, "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord." And this probably does denote distress; so Westminster Study Bible, in loc. So also Oesterley, The Psalms, p. 526, though he points out, "not physical suffering, but the agony of a penitent heart, is what is here represented." And so, too, William R. Taylor, "The Book of Psalms, Exegesis of Psalms 1-71, 93, 95-96, 100, 120-138, 140-150," pp. 17-763 in IB, IV, 678.

Against this interpretation of "depths," however, is W. E. Addis, "The Psalms," pp. 366-396 in PCB, pp. 393-394.

<sup>2</sup>William R. Taylor, op. cit., p. 679.

<sup>3</sup>*ἐλασμός* is used here in a way quite different from that found in I Chr. 28:20, yet it is interesting that LSGL also fails to give the usage *ἐλασμός* has in this instance.





present distress is that the people "have not entreated the favor of the Lord our God" (v. 13). All this is fully in accord with ἱλασμός as representing the propitiation that would change this situation. However, the usage is different from secular usage.

The forgiveness or more propitious attitude is asked for, not on the basis of the people's merit, or even sacrifices. Indeed, "because we have rebelled against him" is the very reason "To the Lord our God belong mercy and forgiveness" (οἱ οἰκτιρμοὶ καὶ οἱ ἱλασμοί).<sup>1</sup> In v. 12<sup>2</sup> it is suggested that God should be propitious to the Hebrew people in order to vindicate his own name, but v. 18<sup>3</sup> makes it patent that the forgiveness is hoped for ultimately on the basis of God's mercy.

ἱλασμός is thus similar to ἐξιλασμός in its cultic uses and to the Hebrew terms which underlie it. Liddell and Scott apparently feel ἱλασμός has more an instrumental usage than ἐξιλασμός,<sup>4</sup> but this study has shown that in

---

<sup>1</sup> Οἰκτιρμοί, which stands parallel with ἱλασμοί in Theodotion's Version, is given the usage by LSGL, p. 1205, in loc., "pity," "compassion," and in the plural "compassionate feelings," "mercies."

<sup>2</sup> Dan. 9:19 (RSV): "O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, give heed and act; delay not, for thy own sake, O my God, because thy city and thy people are called by thy name."

<sup>3</sup> Dan. 9:18 (RSV): "O my God, incline thy ear and hear; open thy eyes and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name; for we do not present our supplications before thee on the ground of our righteousness, but on the ground of thy great mercy."

<sup>4</sup> LSGL, in loc., give the usage of ἱλασμός: "a means of appeasing," "atonement," "sin offering," and again in loc. for ἐξιλασμός: "propitiation," "atonement."

Dan. 9:19(Theodotion's Version) and Ps. 130:4, where it renders  $\text{חַטָּאת}$ , which  $\epsilon\chi\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  does not render, it has the usage of "forgiveness." Here again, while the thought of God's wrath stands in the background, especially in Dan. 9:9, the petitioner relies ultimately on God's mercy.  $\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  in the Greek versions of the Old Testament is a rich word used for "sin" or "a heathen idol," "atonement," "sin offering," "forgiveness," and probably "instrument of propitiation."

### 7. $\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$

$\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ , an adjective, appears 27 times, either alone or in close union with either  $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  or  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ , as the Greek expression of several Hebrew words in the Septuagint version of the canonical Old Testament.<sup>1</sup>

It is not as intimately related to  $\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  and  $\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  as several members of the  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  group and is also related, both in stem and usage, to  $\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ .<sup>2</sup>

$\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  has a wider range of usage than most members of the group, yet the general pattern is that God's mercy is contrasted with his wrath, and the note of propitiation is sometimes but not always present.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix I, Section I, for a listing of every instance of the word with the corresponding Hebrew terms. The seven Hebrew terms are:  $\text{חַטָּאת}$ ,  $\text{עֲוֹן}$ ,  $\text{אֲשָׁם}$ ,  $\text{פֶּלֶא}$ ,  $\text{מִצָּדִיק}$ ,  $\text{מִצָּדִיק}$ ,  $\text{מִצָּדִיק}$ .

<sup>2</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 300, lines 29-31.

<sup>3</sup>Morris, "The Use of  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ," pp. 229-230. Morris gives a study of the usage of this word in the LXX. On p. 229 he remarks: "This word occurs 35x in a variety of constructions, and with a greater range of meaning than we have seen with the other members of the group. Despite this greater range, however, there is a general correspondence with the usage we have seen in the other members of the group."

In Solomon's prayer in I Kings 8, *ἔλεως* appears with *εἶναι* as the rendering of *נָסַח* some five times.<sup>1</sup> And in the latter four appearances of *ἔλεως* in the prayer, in both Kings and Chronicles, the propitiatory note is present,<sup>2</sup> while the first instance of *ἔλεως* has a more general usage.

In Jer. 5:1 God says search for a good man so that he may be *ἔλεως* to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and in v. 7 he asks how can he be *ἔλεως* to the people when they have sinned. The words may be taken as "merciful" or "gracious" or "propitious," and the situation does indicate God's desire to avoid punishing people on the slightest bit of evidence.<sup>3</sup> Yet the setting of the entire situation is set forth in v. 9: "Shall I not punish them for these things? says the Lord; and shall I not avenge myself on a nation such as this?" However in Jer. 50:20 (LXX:27:20), where *ἔλεως* is again used to render *נָסַח*, the thought is one of forgiveness and grace with no thought of wrath.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>These instances, 8:30, 34, 36, 39, and 50, are duplicated in II Chr. 6:21, 25, 27, 39; and 7:14, which quotes a large portion of I Kings 8. Also in Chronicles, the underlying Hebrew is *נָסַח* in all five instances.

<sup>2</sup>See Morris, "The Use of *ἰλάσκεσθαι*," pp. 229-230, where Morris discusses this prayer. In the prayer *ἔλεως* *ἔσθ* is contrasted with falling before enemies, drought, and famine. It clearly involves a changed attitude of God and is usually predicated on repentance and prayer.

<sup>3</sup>Compare Gen. 18:23-33.

<sup>4</sup>For the other instances in Jeremiah where *ἔλεως* is used to render *נָסַח*: Jer. 31:34 (LXX: 38:34) appears to have no sense of propitiation. In Jer. 36:3 (LXX: 43:3) the word is used in the sense of forgive, but stands in contrast to "all the evil I intend to do to them." But notice the purpose of the threat is so that ultimately God may forgive.



In Amos 7:2 and Num. 14:20 the situation in which both  $\pi\lambda\sigma$ <sup>1</sup> and  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  appear is one of the wrath of God.

Is. 54:10, where  $\square\pi\gamma$  stands behind the Greek, the thought is one of mercy, and there is no evidence of any propitiation, but again, v. 8, the mercy stands in contrast to God's wrath that is now past.

In Num. 14:19<sup>2</sup> as in Num. 14:20 the background for this entreaty of Moses is Num. 14:12, in which God threatens to smite and destroy the people.

$\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  appears in the phrase, "Be merciful to Thy people Israel," in Deut. 21:8,<sup>3</sup> and the threat of God's wrath is evident since the entire passage deals with what to do to make atonement in the case of an unsolved murder.

In Ex. 32:12  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  appears where Moses is desperately pleading with God to "cease from thy wrathful anger, and be merciful ( $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ) to the sin of thy people." The idea of propitiation could hardly be clearer.<sup>4</sup>

In Gen. 43:23<sup>5</sup>  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  has the simple usage of "gracious"

<sup>1</sup>In the Hebrew Text.

<sup>2</sup>The underlying Hebrew here is  $\text{נָשָׂא}$ , which usually has the usage of "lift," "carry," "take," and BDB, in loc., give as part of the usage for Num. 14:19 "forgive." But it is also to be noted that  $\text{נָשָׂא}$  following the opening verb indicates the matter is one of entreaty. See further on this point, BDB, p. 609, in loc., and also Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 308, Section 105b.

<sup>3</sup> $\text{רַחֵם}$  is the underlying Hebrew term in this instance.

<sup>4</sup>See supra, pp. 46-48 for a discussion of this passage in more detail. It is interesting that Moses asks for mercy on the basis of what the Egyptians will think of God if he does not fulfill his promises to Israel.  $\square\pi\gamma$  is the underlying Hebrew term here.

<sup>5</sup> $\text{סָלַח}$  is the underlying Hebrew term in this instance.

or some like term, and there is no idea of propitiation.

In four or five instances<sup>1</sup> it is used in an idiomatic expression that renders the Hebrew לִי־לֵיל. The Hebrew term is used as an exclamation with the usage literally of "ad profanum! i.e., far be it (for me, thee, etc.)!"<sup>2</sup> Büchsel observes that Greek cannot literally translate this Hebrew term,<sup>3</sup> but ἔλεως appears four or five times in a deprecatory usage in an attempt to represent this usage.<sup>4</sup> But this usage of ἔλεως, especially interesting since only ἔλεως among the ἐλάσκεσθαι group of words is used in this manner, does not advance the study very much, except to show that the word could be used in an idiomatic way where there was probably no idea of propitiation.

In summation, ἔλεως can be used where the idea of propitiation is evident.<sup>5</sup> It can appear where there is no direct idea of propitiation, but the word stands in contrast to God's wrath.<sup>6</sup> Some instances do not admit exact

---

<sup>1</sup>I Sam. 14:45 (omitted in Rahlfs' edition of LXX and in Cod. B); II Sam. 20:20; II Sam. 20:20 (Cod. A and most others omit); II Sam. 23:17; and II Chr. 11:19.

<sup>2</sup>BDB, p. 321, in loc.

<sup>3</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 301, f.n. 6.

<sup>4</sup>LSGL, p. 827, in loc., not only gives the following usages: of gods, propitious, gracious; of things, propitious, blameless, atoned for; of men, gracious, kindly, but also a deprecatory usage: "be it far from thee."

James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1952), p. 303; also note the deprecatory usage of the word and compare it with the English vernacular expression, "Mercy on us!"

<sup>5</sup>I Kings 8:34, 36, 39, and 50; II Chr. 6:25, 27, 39, and 7:14; Amos 7:2; Num. 14:19, 20; Ex. 32:12.

<sup>6</sup>Jer. 5:1, 7; 36:3.

classification, yet some indicate *ἔλεως* can appear with the usage of forgiveness, grace, or peace with no corresponding thought of wrath immediately present.<sup>1</sup> And finally it is used in an idiomatic expression to represent *לִפְנֵי* in a deprecatory usage.<sup>2</sup> It is indeed a word with a wide variety of usages, but it is to be observed that most instances of the word are in situations where the thought of changing God's attitude from wrath to graciousness, the thought of avoiding God's wrath, or the contrasting indication of God's wrath, either as past or possible, is present. In other words, *ἔλεως* is a rich word, but it usually appears in situations that have some note of propitiation.

#### 8. *ἑλαστήριον*

Since *ἑλαστήριον* appears only once in Pauline literature,<sup>3</sup> and since the influence of the Septuagint on Paul was large,<sup>4</sup> the 27 instances<sup>5</sup> of this word in the Septuagint and other Greek versions of the Old Testament merit detailed consideration. The word, *ἑλαστήριον*, is generally taken in the Old Testament as a neuter noun with the exception of its use in Ex. 25:16, where it is usually considered as an adjective.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Is. 54:10; Jer. 50:20; 31:34; Gen. 43:23.

<sup>2</sup>I Sam. 14:45; II Sam. 20:20, 20; 23:17; II Chr. 11:19.

<sup>3</sup>Rom. 3:25.

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 94, commenting on Rom. 3:25, puts in parentheses: "in accordance with LXX usage, which is constantly determinative for Paul."

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix I, Section G, for a complete tabulation of every instance of *ἑλαστήριον* in the LXX.

<sup>6</sup>William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in the ICC, p. 87, observe: "*ἑλαστήριον*: usually subst. meaning



The manner of approach will be, first, to consider the usage in the Septuagint and then such modifications as the versions may offer.<sup>1</sup> With the exception of Ex. 37:8(LXX:38:7), where the Septuagint gives a very free translation of the Hebrew, there is a Hebrew term underlying each instance of the use of ἱλαστήριον. The context makes it evident in Ex. 37:8 that ἱλαστήριον in this instance is used in the Greek where the Hebrew would have had תְּכֵּיִתֹנָה. In Amos 9:1, where ἱλαστήριον is a poor term to use, it is probable that the translators misread the Hebrew Text and thought they were translating תְּכֵּיִתֹנָה.<sup>2</sup> Thus, of the 26 times ἱλαστήριον

---

strictly 'place or vehicle of propitiation,' but originally neut. of adj. ἱλαστήριος (ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα Ex. 25:16 (17), where however Giff. takes the two words as substantives in apposition)."

Cremer in BTL, p. 305, points out ἱλαστήριον "must be viewed, at least in biblical Greek, as a substantive, and not merely as a substantival neuter of ἱλαστήριος." Cremer later states, however, that in Ex. 25:17 and 37:6 it is used as an adjective.

For Gifford's position, see E. H. Gifford, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, with Notes and Introduction (London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1866), pp. 96-97.

<sup>1</sup>For places where the various versions have either introduced or withdrawn ἱλαστήριον from the text, see Appendix III.

<sup>2</sup>G. Adolf Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," cols. 3027-3035, in Encyclopaedia Biblica, A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, Vol. III (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902) (hereafter abbreviated EB), col. 3032, f.n. 4.

G. Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, translated by Alexander Grieve, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), p. 127, f.n. 1.

T. W. Manson, "ἱΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," pp. 1-10 in JTS, XLVI, 2: "In Amos 9:1 we have ἱλαστήριον where M.T. has תְּכֵּיִתֹנָה, a clear case either of misreading or of translation of a Hebrew variant תְּכֵּיִתֹנָה."

Note: Cod. A and Q replace ἱλαστήριον with θυσιαστήριον. Versions A, S, and T all render the Hebrew with a word different from ἱλαστήριον.

is properly used in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, it represents  $\text{אֵלֶּכֶךְ}$  five times,<sup>1</sup>  $\text{כֶּפֶלֶת}$  20 times,<sup>2</sup> and the idea of  $\text{כֶּפֶלֶת}$  once.<sup>3</sup> The method of investigation will be, first, to consider  $\text{אֵלֶּכֶךְ}$  and then  $\text{כֶּפֶלֶת}$ .

### a. $\text{אֵלֶּכֶךְ}$

While  $\text{אֵלֶּכֶךְ}$  is given the general usage of "apparently 'enclosure,'"<sup>4</sup> it is to be observed that in each of the nine instances it occurs, it is used in a cultic manner, referring to the court of the temple in II Chr. 4:9(2x) and 6:13<sup>5</sup> and to the ledge of the altar in Eze. 43:14(3x), 17, 20; and 45:19. In every instance in Ezekiel except 45:19, the Septuagint has  $\text{ἐλαστήριον}$ .<sup>6</sup>

While in three instances one or more of the other Greek versions replaces  $\text{ἐλαστήριον}$  with another term,<sup>7</sup> the fact remains that in two places it is retained by all the versions.

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix II, Section F, for an indication of every instance of  $\text{אֵלֶּכֶךְ}$ .

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix II, Section C, noting that in Ex. 25:17  $\text{כֶּפֶלֶת}$  is represented by two Greek words:  $\text{ἐλαστήριον}$  and  $\text{ἐπίθεμα}$ .

<sup>3</sup>Ex. 37:8 (EV and HT; LXX: 38:7).

<sup>4</sup>BDB, p. 741, in loc.

<sup>5</sup>While Appendix II, Section F, treats  $\text{אֵלֶּכֶךְ}$  in detail, it is noteworthy that the LXX also renders  $\text{אֵלֶּכֶךְ}$  with "court" in II Chr. 4:9 ( $\text{αὐλῆς}$  and  $\text{αὐλῆς}$ ) and with "court of the temple" in II Chr. 6:13 ( $\text{τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ ἱεροῦ}$ ).

<sup>6</sup>In Eze. 45:19 where the Hebrew reads "the four corners of the ledge of the altar," the LXX reads "the four corners of the ( $\text{ἱεροῦ}$ ) temple, and upon the altar." However, if  $\text{ἱεροῦ}$  is taken to have some of the other usages given in LSGL, p. 822, in loc., such as "holy place" or "sacred object," it could still be a general term for the altar.

<sup>7</sup>See Appendix III, Section B.

The reason ἱλαστήριον is used to render  $\pi\tau\zeta\psi$  is not due to the physical appearance of the  $\pi\tau\zeta\psi$ , but because it was used as a means of propitiation.

Morris is content to observe that in these instances: "The word means either 'means of atonement' (so Büchsel, Deissmann, etc.) or 'place of atonement' (Manson), but in either case it is associated with the cultus."<sup>1</sup> While every instance of  $\pi\tau\zeta\psi$  has some cultic connotation, those passages where it represents a part of the altar are cultic and deal with atonement in the highest degree; hence it is in these instances where the Septuagint uses ἱλαστήριον to render the Hebrew.

It may be well to inquire as to whether the term is to be taken as a place or an instrument of atonement, however. The altar or the cross, to be sure, can be viewed both as the place and the means of atonement. But while the Hebrew term might have had some root meaning, such as "enclosure," ἱλαστήριον never hints at such a geographical meaning, and it is only where  $\pi\tau\zeta\psi$  indicates a part of the central instrument of atonement in the cultic furniture of the temple that ἱλαστήριον is used.

Manson could be clearer on this point. He points out that  $\pi\tau\zeta\psi$  "designates some part of the great altar in Ezekiel's ideal temple"<sup>2</sup> and he indicates that the "altar is intimately connected with a sacrificial ritual whose result

---

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Use of ἱλάσκεσθαι," p. 229.

<sup>2</sup>Manson, "ἹΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 2.



will be that God will accept the people."<sup>1</sup> He adds, however, two sentences that imply that the  $\pi\tau\tau\zeta\psi$  is not a part of the altar:

The stone terraces which support the altar proper get their Greek name from their connexion with the altar and its ritual. They mark the place where the altar stands and the sacrificial ritual is performed.<sup>2</sup>

However, the  $\pi\tau\tau\zeta\psi$  is an integral part of the altar,<sup>3</sup> and if the altar is an instrument of atonement, the  $\pi\tau\tau\zeta\psi$  is likewise not only a place but an instrument of atonement.

Deissmann puts the matter well:

And thus it is of the greatest possible significance that the LXX actually do make a generalising gloss upon another quite different religious conception by  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu$  viz.,  $\pi\tau\tau\zeta\psi$ , the ledge of the altar, Ezek. 43:14, 17, 20; it also, according to ver. 20, had to be sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering, and was therefore a kind of propitiatory article--hence the theologising rendering of the Greek translators.  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu$  here also means neither ledge nor ledge of propitiation, but propitiatory article.<sup>4</sup>

A. T. Robertson is in general agreement with Deissmann, terming his treatment "a lucid and conclusive discussion."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>See A. C. Zenos, "Temple," pp. 890-900, SBD, p. 895. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, p. 139.

John Skinner, The Book of Ezekiel, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905), p. 408.

G. A. Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, in the ICC, p. 466.

<sup>4</sup>Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 126-127.

See also Deissmann, in "Mercy Seat," EB, III, col. 3032.

Adol. Deissmann, " $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu$  und  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu$ . Eine lexikalische Studie," pp. 193-212, in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums (hereafter abbreviated ZWKU), Vierter Jahrgang, 1903, p. 196.

Moulton, Howard, and Milligan also apparently concur with Deissmann.<sup>1</sup> More recently Büchsel, citing Ex. 25:16, which will be considered under תָּרִיבֹּ, maintains ἱλαστήριον in the Septuagint is not to be understood as any special object<sup>2</sup> but as "das Sühnende ganz allgemein."<sup>3</sup> And he points out that ἱλαστήριον is used to render תָּרִיבֹּ solely because of the cultic meaning of תָּרִיבֹּ.<sup>4</sup>

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study of תָּרִיבֹּ are:

1. תָּרִיבֹּ is not related etymologically to רִיבֹּ words or to the תָּרִיבֹּ.
2. Yet תָּרִיבֹּ is rendered in the majority of the instances in which it occurs with ἱλαστήριον, so ἱλαστήριον cannot be termed the Greek equivalent of any Hebrew term since it is used for both תָּרִיבֹּ and תָּרִיבֹּ.
3. תָּרִיבֹּ is rendered with ἱλαστήριον not because it indicates a ledge but because of the use to which the ledge is put, i.e., it is a means of making atonement. Hence

---

<sup>1</sup>James Hope Moulton and Wilbert Francis Howard, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. II, Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), p. 342, ἱλαστήριον is considered as a noun of "Instrument or Means," and reference is made to Deissmann. On the other hand, Gremer in BTL, p. 305, takes ἱλαστήριον as a "nomen loci."

See also Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p. 303, where Deissmann is followed.

<sup>2</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 320, lines 24-25: "so bedeutet das Wort in LXX doch nicht: 'Sühnstätte,' sondern: Sühnaufsatz, Sühngerät."

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., line 31.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., lines 31-33. See also f.n. 12.

ἑλαστήριον, which never has the usage of "ledge" or "border," is used to render  $\pi\tau\tau\tau\tau$  where  $\pi\tau\tau\tau\tau$  indicates a part of the altar, because of the usage and purpose of the altar, to make atonement.

4. ἑλαστήριον in these passages is used to render  $\pi\tau\tau\tau\tau$  with the sense "instrument, or means of atonement or propitiation."

5. Only such a general, instrumental usage of ἑλαστήριον will permit it to render Hebrew words that physically refer to such different things as a gold plate and a stone ledge, but belong to the same cultic category where rendered by ἑλαστήριον, an instrument of propitiation or atonement.

6. On the basis of these instances only, it cannot be said whether ἑλαστήριον is to be taken as instrument of propitiation, reconciliation, expiation, or cleansing. Perhaps the more general term "instrument of atonement" is preferable, for in Ezekiel's ideal situation the people are aware of their iniquities (Eze. 43:10-11) and sin offerings are to be offered (Eze. 43:21-22), but the primary purpose of these is to cleanse the altar (Eze. 43:22) and to atone for it, purify it, and consecrate it (Eze. 43:26). Yet the note of propitiation is in the background of all these proceedings for the final promise of God when all rites are completed is "and I will accept you (Eze. 43:27)."<sup>1</sup> All these various

---

<sup>1</sup>See supra, p. 32f., for comment on Eze. 43:27.



rites(vv. 18-27) tend toward the ultimate purpose and hope expressed in Eze. 43:27.

## כַּפֹּרֶת ב.

כַּפֹּרֶת appears 27 times in the Old Testament, and, with the exception of I Chr. 28:11, each instance in "P" material.<sup>1</sup> In each Old Testament instance it refers to "a slab of gold 2½ cubits x 1½c. placed on top of the ark of the testimony."<sup>2</sup> If the word is taken as a derivative from כָּפַר "cover over Sin" as Brown-Driver-Briggs suggest,<sup>3</sup> even though כַּפֹּרֶת is a late technical term<sup>4</sup> remote from כָּפַר,<sup>5</sup> that would at least not speak against the suggestion that the word is a 'nomen actoris.'<sup>6</sup>

Even though the word כַּפֹּרֶת always refers to the slab of gold placed on top of the ark of the testimony, scholars do not agree as to why this golden plate that rested on top of the ark was called כַּפֹּרֶת. One suggestion is

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix II, Section C, for a listing of every instance of כַּפֹּרֶת.

<sup>2</sup>BDB, p. 498, in loc.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Herrmann, TWNT, III, 303, lines 1-2.

<sup>6</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," EB, III, col. 3027, suggests כַּפֹּרֶת is derived from the piel of כָּפַר and is thus a 'nomen actoris,' and without endorsing it, in cols. 3028-3029, presents the study of Lagarde, where an attempt is made to relate כַּפֹּרֶת with the Arabic kaffārat (Compare Stamm, op. cit., p. 61 ff., where כָּפַר is held to be related to the Arabic kafara). In "Ἰλαστήριον und Ἰλαστήριον," ZWKE, Deissmann goes further in his endorsement of Lagarde's view though still with reservations.

S. Fraenkel, "Zu dem semitischen Original von Ἰλαστήριον und Ἰλαστήριον," pp. 257-258, ZWKE, 1904, and P. Fiebig and G. Klein, "Kappôres," pp. 341-344, ZWKE, 1903, criticize Deissmann, especially in so far as he relies on Lagarde and more recent Jewish usage.

that כִּפְרֶת, related to the verb כָּפַר with a usage of "cover," means "cover,"<sup>1</sup> more especially "the cover of the ark." Yet since גָּבַח, שֹׁמַיִם, כִּסֵּי, כִּסֵּי, כִּסֵּי, and כִּסֵּי all have the usage of "head," "top," "roof," or "covering" and are never used for this gold plate on top of the ark, and since כִּפְרֶת is never used for any other kind of covering, if it means "cover," it must mean much more than merely "cover." Most scholars today reject such a theologically bare rendering of the word.<sup>2</sup>

Another suggestion is to take it as "propitiatory" without modification.<sup>3</sup> Of the two suggestions, this is the better by far. כִּפְרֶת is always used of this cultic object, and while the Greek word for cover is used only once to help render the word,<sup>4</sup> and there in combination with ἱλαστήριον, ἱλαστήριον alone or ἐξιλασμός is used to

<sup>1</sup>Koehler in KBL, p. 453, in loc.

<sup>2</sup>BDB, in loc.; Herrmann, TWNT, III, 303, line 2; p. 319, line 22 ff.; Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," EB, III, col. 3027 f.; Deissmann, "ἱλαστήριον und ἱλαστήριον," ZWZ, pp. 193-212.

Paul Billerbeck, Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch, Zweite, unveränderte Auflage, Dritter Band, in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Hermann L. Strack und Paul Billerbeck (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954), p. 175, indicates later Jews took the כִּפְרֶת to be much more than a mere cover too: "Wie eng für die jüdische Vorstellung die Kapporeth mit dem Sühnedenken verwachsen war, beweist die Wiedergabe des Wortes 'Kapporeth' in den Targumin mit 'Stätte des Sühnens' כִּפְרֶת (כִּפְרֶת) Inf. Pa(ol). Metonymisch hat man diese Bezeichnung dann auch auf den ganzen Raum des Allerheiligsten übertragen."

<sup>3</sup>BDB, p. 408, in loc.

<sup>4</sup>Ex. 25:17.

render it in the Septuagint in every other instance. However, if כַּפֶּרֶת has a usage so general, it is difficult to understand why it is never used for any other propitiatory article or place except the golden plate which rested on top of the ark of the testimony.

There is reason to believe that כַּפֶּרֶת contains both the idea of a "cover" and a "propitiatory"<sup>1</sup> and that an examination of the first instance where כַּפֶּרֶת is used in the Old Testament will make this more certain.

In Ex. 25:17, both כַּפֶּרֶת and ἱλαστήριον make their initial appearance in the Old Testament: "Then you shall make a mercy seat (HT: כַּפֶּרֶת; LXX: ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα) of pure gold; . . ." However, before considering the usage of the words, attention should be given to T. W. Manson's argument that ἐπίθεμα, which only appears again with ἱλαστήριον in the Complutensian of Ex. 37:6,<sup>2</sup> "was written in the margin of some early manuscript" and "has crept into the text and taken a place, sometimes before, sometimes after ἱλαστήριον, thus giving rise to the existing conflated readings." Manson concludes, "If that is so, we are dispensed from the need to explain ἱλαστήριον in terms of ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans (London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.; Glasgow: T. D. Morison, 1866), pp. 290-291.

Leon Morris, "The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3:25," pp. 33-43 in New Testament Studies, Vol. II, No. 1, Sept. 1955.

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 3.



Why is ἐπίθεμα to be disregarded? Manson observes that the word order is reversed in six manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> Yet none of the six includes Cod. A, B, or S,<sup>2</sup> but are less important manuscripts. If ἑλαστήριον and ἐπίθεμα are viewed as both being nouns standing in apposition with each other, it makes no difference which precedes the other.<sup>3</sup> If ἑλαστήριον is considered as an adjective, the New Testament affords examples of where the adjective both precedes and follows the noun. Where the adjective precedes the noun, as in most manuscripts that contain this word, the adjective, rather than the noun, points up the meaning.<sup>4</sup> Ἐπίθεμα is omitted from only one manuscript and the Latin version of Origen,<sup>5</sup> which is a negative way of saying that it is found in nearly every manuscript. If, as Manson suggests, ἐπίθεμα were "written in the margin of some early manuscript," it must have been one of the earliest, and it must have been a very popular notation. Thus while ἐπίθεμα, in the light of the manuscript evidence, is judged to be genuine, if Manson's theory that it was added to the margin of an early manuscript is accepted, his conclusion that "we are dispensed from the need to explain ἑλαστήριον in terms of ἑλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα" does not follow.<sup>6</sup> The

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, op. cit., Vol. I, Part II, p. 236, list "b, n, s, v, w, and z" where the word order is reversed.

<sup>3</sup>Gifford, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>4</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 418.

<sup>5</sup>T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 3, and Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, op. cit., Vol. I, Part II, p. 236.

<sup>6</sup>W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1955), p. 240, agrees with Manson: "Manson has convincingly shown that

questions as to why some scribe felt it necessary to add  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$  and why it found its way into nearly every manuscript would still require an explanation.

The fact that  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$  has the idea of both covering and propitiation was not only recognized long ago by Morison<sup>1</sup> but has been considered several times by Deissmann. In Bible Studies he writes: " $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$  is doubtless a translation of  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$  the word;  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$   $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$  is a rendering of  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$  the religious concept."<sup>2</sup> While the predominant use of  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  to render  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$  in the Septuagint indicates that the use of the gold plate, rather than the root of  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$ , was uppermost in the minds of the translators, he does recognize both elements in the word  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$ . Later Deissmann modified this position, writing that "... the LXX took up the idea of  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$  quite rightly, and saw the expression to be elliptical; only, in the first passage where the word occurred, they filled up the ellipsis, giving  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$   $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$  for ( $\kappa\epsilon\iota$   $h\alpha k$ -)  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$ , because in point of fact, the object to which the word was applied was a sort of plate which in some way or other served as a lid to the ark. In all subsequent passages the ellipsis of the original is adhered to: LXX regularly has  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  for  $\text{כֶּפֶר}$ ."<sup>3</sup> Deissmann has rightly shifted his emphasis

the word  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$  in Exod. 25:16(17) is highly suspect and is to be rejected."

<sup>1</sup>James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, p. 290 f.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 125.

<sup>3</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," EB, III, col. 3032. The same position is maintained by Deissmann in " $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  und  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ " ZWKU.

of the main idea of כִּפָּרֶת from cover to propitiatory, yet as he points out, the כִּפָּרֶת was used as a cover, and ἐπίθεμα means cover, not instrument. Thus while it may be a derivative of the verb, כִּלִּי never appears with any instance of כִּפָּרֶת, and considering the relationship of כִּפָּרֶת to the verb whose root usage may well be cover, which Deissmann recognizes,<sup>1</sup> any ellipsis in כִּפָּרֶת would also contain within itself the idea of covering, i.e., "the cover that is an instrument of propitiation" or "the instrument of propitiation that covers the ark." The fact that כִּפָּרֶת is never used for any other instrument of propitiation besides the golden plate on the ark speaks against so general a usage as "instrument of propitiation" for it. But following the same line of reasoning, since ἱλαστήριον is used for instruments of propitiation other than the mercy seat, Deissmann is correct in giving ἱλαστήριον the general usage "propitiatory article"<sup>2</sup> or "propitiatory thing."<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, Büchsel is believed correct in maintaining that ἱλαστήριον does not have a local but an instrumental usage in complete generality, though the reason for this becomes clearer later in our investigation.<sup>4</sup> Büchsel writes:

---

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," *EB*, III, col. 3027.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 126.

<sup>3</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," *EB*, III, col. 3032.

Herrmann, *TWNT*, III, 319, gives "Sühnmittel" und "Sühnort" as usages of ἱλαστήριον.

<sup>4</sup>Note especially IV Macc. 17:22 where ἱλαστήριον, appearing both as an adjective (Cod. A) and as a noun (Cod. S), refers to the death of martyrs. This could hardly be a "place" of propitiation.

In profane usage in Josephus' *Antiquities* 16:182, ἱλαστήριον indicates the purpose, not the place of the memorial in question.



Wenn auch substantivierte Neutra vielfach den Ort bezeichnen, der der im Verbalbegriff enthaltenen Handlung dient, so bedeutet das Wort in LXX doch nicht: "Sühnstätte," sondern: "Sühnaufsatz, Sühngerät." Denn das erstmal Ex. 25:16(17) übersetzt sie: וְיָצַקְתָּ בָּהֶן זָהָב טָהוֹר mit: καὶ ποιήσεις ἑλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα χρυσοῦ καθαροῦ, dh sie führt ihre Übersetzung von וְיָצַקְתָּ mit ἑλαστήριον dadurch ein, dass sie zum Adjektivum ἑλαστήριον, das sie im folgenden substantivierte braucht, an der ersten Stelle das im hebräischen Text nicht gegebene Substantivum ἐπίθεμα setzt. Daraus erhellt, dass für sie τὸ ἑλαστήριον an sich nicht einen räumlichen Gegenstand, sondern: das Sühnende ganz allgemein bedeutet.<sup>1</sup>

The generality of ἑλαστήριον is further indicated by the fact that wherever it appears as a rendering of וְיָצַקְתָּ it is grammatically equipped with a definite article<sup>2</sup> and there is, moreover, "something in the context to make clear which propitiating instrument ἑλαστήριον is to denote."<sup>3</sup>

As to whether ἑλαστήριον is better to be understood as "means of propitiation," "means of atonement," "means of expiation," or yet some other instrumental force, these particular passages under consideration where it renders וְיָצַקְתָּ do not permit a decision.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 320, lines 23-31. Underlining represents Büchsel's italics.

<sup>2</sup>Vincent Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation. A Study in New Testament Theology (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952), p. 39, f.n. 3, points out regarding ἑλαστήριον used to render וְיָצַקְתָּ: "As thus used the word invariably has the definite article, except in Ex. 25:16(17) where the noun ἐπίθεμα is added." See also Appendix I, Section G.

<sup>3</sup>Morris, in "The Meaning of ἑλαστήριον," p. 33, f.n. 1, refers to an article in The Expository Times, LXII, 227, ff., as to why he prefers "propitiation" to other terms. But in the article referred to, "The Use of ἐλάσκεσθαι," p. 229, he states regarding ἑλαστήριον, "we will deal with the idea involved under ἐξιλάσκεσθαι."

Ἐξιλασμός, which renders  $\text{נִדְּחָה}$  in I Chr. 28:11, does more than serve as additional proof that ἱλαστήριον and  $\text{נִדְּחָה}$  are not iron-bound synonyms.<sup>1</sup> Since it usually appears in cultic situations where its exact usage cannot be determined, but does appear in Eze. 7:25 in a non-cultic situation where the idea of propitiation is present, Ἐξιλασμός might indicate a slight preference for "instrument or means of propitiation." Yet in Leviticus 16, which is the one instance in the Old Testament where the function of the  $\text{נִדְּחָה}$  is discussed in detail, the action is spoken of as cleansing the people from all their sins (Lev. 16:30). Granted that the wrath of God would be provoked if the ritual were not observed (Lev. 16:34) and that the basic thought is to remove the sins from the people (note the scapegoat in vv. 21-22) so that they may be in harmony, at peace, at one with God, the action does not seem to be to change any specific wrathful attitude of God to one of graciousness. While "means of propitiation" or "means of cleansing from sin" or "means of expiation" are not forbidden, until additional evidence is brought forward from the sacred writings of the Jews, it is perhaps best tentatively to hold in abeyance the assigning to ἱλαστήριον a more specific usage than "means of atonement."

#### c. ἱλαστήριον in the Version of Symmachus

Reference has already been made to the several places

---

<sup>1</sup> However, Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, *op. cit.*, in *loc.*, note Ἐξιλασμός is replaced by ἱλαστήριον in "b," "e<sub>2</sub>," and Theodoret's version.

where one or more of the major Greek versions of the Old Testament other than the Septuagint, i.e., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, depart from the Septuagint by omitting *ἐλαστήριον*.<sup>1</sup>

Only in the version of Symmachus<sup>2</sup> is *ἐλαστήριον* found where it does not also appear in the Septuagint. This instance is in Genesis 6:15 (LXX 6:16) after Noah's ark has been described in v. 14 (LXX:15) with *κιβωτόν*; the Septuagint rendering for *תַּיִת* . . . *תַּיִת* , *τὴν κιβωτόν* . . . *τῆς κιβωτοῦ* is replaced with *(τὸ) ἐλαστήριον* . . . *(τοῦ) ἐλαστηρίου*.<sup>3</sup>

Manson again in this place indicates *ἐλαστήριον* refers to a place.<sup>4</sup> And to be sure, the ark was a place of grace<sup>5</sup> in that God was gracious to those inside the ark. But it was not the place that Noah propitiated God or atoned for his sins; rather Symmachus "regarded it as a means of propitiation."<sup>6</sup> The ark is not merely to be regarded as a means or

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix III, Section B, items 3, 5, 6, and 7 for the details as to the particular versions and what words they have substituted for *ἐλαστήριον*. See also *supra*, pp. 58-60.

<sup>2</sup>Rahlfs, *op. cit.*, observes in the preface, I, xxvii: "Symmachus provided an entirely new translation of the O.T. In common with all later translators he kept closely to the Hebrew text. He was, however, anxious to make his translation good Greek, . . ." I, 23.

<sup>3</sup>Field, *op. cit.*, I, 23.

<sup>4</sup>Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 321, lines 1-2, makes no attempt to explain *ἐλαστήριον* here, writing: "Was Symmachus gemeint hat, wenn er die Arche Noahs Gn. 6:16(15) *ἐλαστήριον* nennt, bleibt dunkel."

<sup>5</sup>Deissmann, "ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟC und ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," *ZWNU*, pp. 196, 107, 198.

<sup>6</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," *EB*, III, col. 3031.



instrument of propitiation because God was gracious to those within it.<sup>1</sup> Noah's obedience to God in constructing the ark was no doubt pleasing to God, and the obedience and faith that the ark represented made it a "means or instrument of propitiation" in a deeper sense. The fact that the people in the ark were spared was proof that God had acted propitiously towards Noah and his family. Moreover, as Morris observes, "the ark would not naturally be interpreted as a place."<sup>2</sup>

But this verse not only reaffirms the view that *ἱλαστήριον* is not a synonym for *ἡ γὰρ οὐκ*; and it not only emphasizes the point that *ἱλαστήριον* has an instrumental rather than a locative usage, but it also makes possible a more specific determination of the nature of its instrumental force. The situation was that because of the great sin of man, God had decided to destroy mankind (Gen. 6:5-8; 11-13). There is no doubt that mankind with the exception of Noah and his family was under the wrath of God (Gen. 6:8-9). By his faith<sup>3</sup> and obedience in making the ark and entering into it, Noah experienced the graciousness of God while everyone else

---

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann seems to approach this position in Bible Studies, p. 128, f.n. 4: "The present writer agrees with Field in this matter, and believes that Symmachus desired by this rendering to describe the Ark as a means of propitiation: God was gracious to such as took refuge in the Ark."

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἱλαστήριον*," p. 37. In like manner today, a ship is more likely to be considered an object to see or a means of conveying people and goods than a place. It is too mobile.

<sup>3</sup>Cuthbert A. Simpson, "The Book of Genesis, Introduction and Exegesis," pp. 439-829 in IB, Vol. I, p. 536, observes: "Thus, according to J<sup>2</sup>, Noah built the ark in faith, not knowing its purpose but simply obeying the Lord's command."

felt the destroying wrath of God.

ἱλαστήριον, having the usage "means of propitiation," in Symmachus' version at this point, makes it more probable that the word has such usage also in the other instances in the Septuagint, which permit but do not in themselves require such usage. Moreover, the fact that Symmachus uses ἱλαστήριον with such a usage, writing within 134 years after Paul wrote Romans, is important.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, there are points in common between the function of the ark and the sacrificial system. God took the initiative; Noah did not shrewdly decide that an ark would be worth while, but God commanded him to make it. Yet obedience also was required, and the ark was the specified means through which Noah might experience the graciousness of God and escape his wrath.

#### D. Summation

In regard to sin, God is presented in the Old Testament as holy, moral, and righteous. "He abhorreth not evil" (Ps. 36:4) is applied to a wicked man, not God. Sin, and usually that alone,<sup>2</sup> provokes the wrath of God. And such wrath is

---

<sup>1</sup>Sanday and Headlam in Commentary on Romans, ICC, xxxvii, date Romans A.D. 58.

John R. S. Sterrett and John Moore Trout, in "Versions," pp. 933-937 in SBD, p. 935, feel it is probable Symmachus wrote "during the reign of Commodus (180-192)." The following comment, given in this article on Symmachus' style also is interesting in the light of Gen. 6:15 (LXX:16): "In his translation his aim was essentially the modern one, to give a liberal idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew, not a crude literal translation--that is, he tried really to translate Hebrew thoughts into the current Greek literary style, and the fragments of his version show that he did not fail of success."

<sup>2</sup>I Sam. 26:19 and II Sam. 24:1 ff. (compare the different treatment of this episode in I Chr. 21:1 ff.) are possible though not necessary exceptions.

personal, even as the offence is personal (Ps. 51:1-4).<sup>1</sup>

While the vow offering and burnt offering had propitiatory purposes at an early date, excessive anthropomorphism was eliminated in the priestly writings, but the worshipper was still conceived of as standing in a personal relationship to God. In dealing with this development in propitiatory sacrifices, it is well to remember that sacrifices were not viewed as a means of effecting reconciliation for presumptuous sins, that with the possible exception of Jeremiah the prophets did not object to the use of sacrifices but rather to their abuse, and the idea of propitiation, for example as with Phinehas, is still discernible.

Two points especially noteworthy are: (1) The vicarious aspect of sacrifice comes out clearly in the priestly writings. (2) The sacrificial system is considered as a means given on the initiative of God himself as a means of maintaining his holiness while manifesting his mercy. Yet the offender must act in obedience according to the manner God has graciously established, if the wrath of God is to be averted. "Atonement then, in the Old Testament, represents the

---

<sup>1</sup>Leon Morris, "The Wrath of God," pp. 142-145, in The Expository Times, Vol. LXIII, No. 4, Feb., 1952, pp. 144-145: "... a God who does not loathe evil is not surely a God whom we can worship. It may be that 'the wrath of God' is not a perfect way of describing this Divine reaction--few would maintain that it is--but it does at least remind us of the fact of God's hostility to evil, and we must refuse alternative expressions which do not safeguard this truth. To speak of an impersonal retribution does not, for it implies that God personally is indifferent to moral evil."



offering by man of that gift which God has appointed as a means of putting away sin, and averting the consequences of the Divine wrath, which else must rest upon the sinner."<sup>1</sup>

The earliest instances of רָצַח, Gen. 32:21 and Ex. 32:30, both from "E" and both rendered in the Septuagint by ἐλάσκεισθαι, have the usage of "propitiate," "appease," "change the mood of the object (in one case Esau and in the other God) from wrath to peacefulness." In other instances רָצַח can have the usage of "forgive," yet such forgiveness usually stands in contrast to destruction. For God to forgive is to withhold his wrath.

In the priestly writings, the vicarious aspect of "kippuring" is seen in Ex. 30:11-16. It is noteworthy that the object of the verb is always the sinner, not the sin, which indicates the idea of a restored personal relationship rather than an expiation of sin in an impersonal way.

Ἐξιλιάσκεσθαι and ἐλάσκεισθαι also render on occasion such verbs as פָּלַח, נָחַם, שָׁחַט, שָׁלַח, and קָנָה, and all such verbs are either amenable to the idea of propitiation, or adamantly call for it, or tacitly presuppose it. Sometimes one Hebrew verb can convey more than one idea at a time, as in Ex. 30:10 where רָצַח expresses the idea of both cleansing and reconciliation.<sup>2</sup>

Ἐξίλασμα is interesting because of its stem similar to

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," p. 93.

<sup>2</sup>See supra, p. 38. Note also p. 44, where it is observed "פָּלַח" can have the usage of "forgive" and yet not exclude thoughts of propitiation and divine anger.

ἱλασμός and also because of the frequency with which it is used to render  $\text{כִּפּוּר}$ . Indeed, in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion it renders  $\text{כִּפּוּר}$  more often than any other Greek word.

ἱλασμός is a rich word in the Septuagint with various usages and Hebrew counterparts.<sup>1</sup> On occasion it conveys the idea of "forgiveness," and though God's anger yet looms in the background, forgiveness is hoped for primarily because of God's grace. Such instances represent a considerable transition from most secular usage. Since it has such a wide range of meaning in its relatively small number of occurrences in the Septuagint, the way in which it is to be translated in any given situation must depend upon the context.

ἱλαστήριον is seen to have a general usage and not to be a synonym for  $\text{כִּפּוּר}$ , though it usually does render this Hebrew term in the Septuagint. Moreover, it has an instrumental and not a locative usage. Finally, in view of the version of Symmachus, it has a propitiatory purpose. Though the evidence could be more conclusive, the usage that appears best to fit all the evidence is "instrument or means of propitiation." That ἱλαστήριον was considered to have such a usage by Symmachus in the second century A.D. is very probable.

---

<sup>1</sup>In six occurrences in the Old Testament, it represents four Hebrew terms and once appears without any corresponding term in the Hebrew text.

Even if Amos 8:14 is considered an error of the translators (see *supra*, p. 49), it has such usages as "atonement," "sin offering," "forgiveness," and probably "instrument of propitiation."

Ἰλαστήριον in the Old Testament is an instrument or means whereby, if used in accordance with God's commandments, man is enabled to experience the grace rather than the wrath of God. As such it can be termed an instrument or means of propitiation. However, it is important to note that the ἰλαστήριον itself, whether it be the mercy seat, a part of the altar, or Noah's ark, is never conceived in the mind of man as a means of propitiating God, but is ordered to be made, or initially described, by God himself. God has the initiative.



## Chapter II

### EVIDENCE IN THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

#### A. Method of Procedure

"For students both of the Old and New Testaments the value of the non-Canonical Jewish literature from 200 B.C. to A.D. 100 is practically recognized on every side alike by Jewish and Christian scholars."<sup>1</sup> "In addition to the spiritual and moral service rendered by these books, the modern student recognizes that without them it is absolutely impossible to explain the course of religious development between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100."<sup>2</sup> These statements by R. H. Charles in 1913 are being underlined every day by the interest of scholars in the famous Dead Sea Scrolls.

For the purpose of this study, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha will be considered as the non-canonical religious works of the Jews between 300 B.C. and 100 A.D. with the exception of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Damascus Document or, as Charles terms it, "The Fragments of a Zadokite Work." The Dead Sea Scrolls, especially the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document, will be considered in Chapter III. In

---

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Charles, "Preface," p. iii, in R. H. Charles (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books (hereafter abbreviated CAP), 2 vols., (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913), I, iii.

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Charles "Introduction to Volume I," CAP, I, x.

short, the same material will be considered as Charles treats in his two volume work, except for "The Fragments of a Zadokite Work."

The method will be to consider first instances that throw some light on the question of propitiation in a general way or use a Latin term related to the idea of propitiation, and to consider secondly the various Greek words wherever they occur and the corresponding Hebrew term when it is known.

Since this body of literature had various purposes and was written over a wide range of time, some introductory notes will give the setting of the work, in the first instance in which a term is cited from any book. On occasion this can be important, as with IV Maccabees.

## B. General Observations

### 1. Data

#### a. I Baruch

The Book of Baruch, or First Baruch, is believed by O. C. Whitehouse<sup>1</sup> to be a composite work, written probably in Hebrew some time after 70 A.D. and translated into Greek during the second century A.D. This work is contemporaneous with much of the New Testament. It discusses the wrath of God as evidenced in the fall of Jerusalem, and the idea of entreating God to be merciful is prominent,<sup>2</sup> but it does not use any

---

<sup>1</sup>O. C. Whitehouse, "The Book of Baruch or I Baruch," pp. 569-595 in CAP, I, 569-576.

<sup>2</sup>I Baruch 1:13: "Pray for us also unto the Lord our God, for we have sinned against the Lord our God, and unto this day the wrath of the Lord and his indignation is not turned from us."

I Baruch 2:8: "Yet have we not entreated the favour of

form of ἱλάσκεσθαι . Deliverance is asked not on the basis of the merits of the people and their rulers or fathers, but with hope in God's own power of graciousness.<sup>1</sup> The idea of an awareness of sin, the presence of God's wrath, the need of a change in God's attitude, yet along with an awareness of the unworthiness of the people, and a hope of deliverance rooted ultimately on God's own mercy--these strongly remind the reader of the general feeling of the New Testament. It is not surprising to find that "The influence of the book on ecclesiastical Christian literature has been far greater than upon the Jewish."<sup>2</sup>

#### b. Jubilees

The Book of Jubilees is quite different from I Baruch, and has been termed "the most advanced pre-Christian representative of the midrashic tendency, which has already been at work in Old Testament Chronicles."<sup>3</sup> It was written at the close of the second or beginning of the first century B.C.<sup>4</sup> While believed to have been originally written in Hebrew, not only is there no Hebrew copy available, but only a few

---

the Lord" (Greek: καὶ οὐκ ἔδεήθημεν τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου).

<sup>1</sup>I Baruch 2:13-14; 2:19-20; 3:5-7.

<sup>2</sup>Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 580.

<sup>3</sup>R. H. Charles, "The Book of Jubilees," pp. 1-82, CAP, II, 1.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. "The Book of Jubilees was written in Hebrew by a Pharisee between . . . 135 and . . . 105 B.C."

R. H. Charles, The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), p. lix. The date is here fixed at between 135 and 96 B.C.



fragments of the Greek copy and about one-fourth of the Latin copy have been preserved.<sup>1</sup> While none of the Greek fragments contain any member of the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group of words, the Latin text contains forms of the *propitio* group of words in four instances.<sup>2</sup>

In Jubilees 16:22 "propitiari" occurs, but the entire ritual is one of praise and thanksgiving as Abraham worships God. In Jubilees 22:14 Abraham is blessing Jacob and praying that God may forgive Jacob when he sins. There is no thought of the wrath of God, yet the alternative to forgiveness when one sins against God is usually destruction. So in Jubilees 30:10 when a man defiles his daughter there is no remission nor any atonement ("et omnis propitiatio"), "but the man who has defiled his daughter shall be rooted out in the midst of all Israel." In Jubilees 29:13 "propitiatus est" indicates that Esau was reconciled to Jacob, referring to the incident spoken of in Genesis 32, which is clearly a story of propitiation.

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Charles, The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew of Jubilees otherwise known among the Greeks as Η ΛΕΠΤΗ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΣ Edited from Four Manuscripts and critically revised through a continuous comparison of the Masoretic and Samaritan Texts, and the Greek, Syriac, Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions of the Pentateuch, and further emended and restored in accordance with the Hebrew, Syriac, Greek and Latin Fragments of this Book, which are here published in full (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895) is the source of Greek fragments and Latin text.

<sup>2</sup>a. "propitiari," Jubilees 16:22, translated by Charles, "that he might atone."

b. "ut propitius sit," Jubilees 22:14, translated by Charles, "that thou mayest be forgiven."

c. "propitiatus (est)," Jubilees 29:13, translated by Charles, "he was reconciled."

d. "et omnis propitiatio," Jubilees 30:10, translated by Charles, "nor any atonement."

## c. The Assumption of Moses

The Assumption of Moses, believed to have been written in Hebrew and translated into Greek in the first century A.D.,<sup>1</sup> has not come down in either of the languages, but is known through a Latin translation.<sup>2</sup> The fact that it was written contemporaneously with the early life of our Lord adds to its interest. Moses, while alive, is viewed as the intercessor of Israel (11:17).<sup>3</sup> In fact Hilgenfeld uses *ἐλασκόμενος* in translating this portion of the text back into Greek.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, Moses, after his death, is viewed as interceding not only for Israel but for all the world (12:1-7). Yet Moses' role of intercessor or mediator for the world is his, not because of Moses' merit or desire but because of God's love (12:7) and plan for the world (12:1-6).

Such high teaching is especially important since it was written by a Jew during the early life of Christ, since Moses was viewed as propitiating God with an oath on behalf of the children of Israel, and since the work of Moses was considered

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Charles, "The Assumption of Moses," pp. 407-424 in *GAP*, II, 407.

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Charles, The Assumption of Moses translated from the Latin sixth century MS., the unemended text of which is published herewith, together with the text in its restored and critically emended form, edited with introduction, notes and indices (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1897).

<sup>3</sup>The Latin reads, in Charles' The Assumption of Moses Translated from the Latin Sixth Century MS., p. 96, "jure-jurendo placendo Dominum."

<sup>4</sup>Adolphus Hilgenfeld (Edidit), Messias Judaeorum, Libris Eorum Paula Ante Et Paulo Post Christum Natum Conscriptis Illustratus (Lipsiae: Sumptu Fuesiano (R. Reisland), 1869), p. 456, reads *ἐπωμοσία ἐλασκόμενος τὸν κύριον*.

a part of God's plan for all nations. Propitiation, with God taking the initiative; intercession--by Moses both before and after his assumption; a sense of God's providence and election--coupled with notes of responsibility (12:10-11) and even universalism (12:3-4)--these cause this work to be an important bridge connecting the Old and New Testament teaching on propitiation and also other doctrines. It is unfortunate the complete work does not exist in either Hebrew or Greek.

## 2. Summation

Observations of Jewish works such as I Baruch and The Assumption of Moses show that Charles has grounds for stating: "The apocalyptic and legalistic sides of pre-Christian Pharisaism--starting originally from the same source--developed ultimately into Christianity and Talmudic Judaism."<sup>1</sup> Even as the legalism of Ezra was perpetuated in the Talmud, so the work of Jonah was also followed by other apocalyptic and pseudipigraphal works, much closer to Christianity than the Talmud. It is important to note that I Baruch and The Assumption of Moses were written by Jews. If, then, ideas are found in Paul and John (who were also Jews) different from the Talmud, that does not necessarily mean that they were derived from Hellenistic thought. They could be voices of a form of Judaism that, while not the ancestor of the Talmud, was still very definitely rooted in the Old Testament and was a part of Judaism not to be overlooked in viewing the

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles, "Introduction to Volume II," GAP, II, viii.



total Hebraic background of Paul's and John's thinking.

It may be claimed that I Baruch and The Assumption of Moses, which Charles dates A.D. 7-30,<sup>1</sup> were products of a Judaism that was already Hellenized. To be sure, the Jews could not be unaware of Greek culture, and the Jews who opposed it may have been those most influenced by it. Yet these works all honor Moses, the Law, and have a sovereign view of God, and are basically to be considered Hebrew writings, especially if, as Charles assumes, they were originally written in Hebrew. In any event, the door is open to the possibility that some elements in Paul and John, claimed by some to be Hellenistic, were not borrowed by them from Hellenistic thought, but had been assimilated into a strain of Hebraic thought prior to the time of Paul and John.

### ο. ἰλάσκεσθαι and Related Words<sup>2</sup>

#### 1. Ἐξιλάσκεσθαι

Forms of ἔξιλάσκεσθαι appear some 14 times in this body of literature, nine times in the book of Sirach,<sup>3</sup> where, in five instances of the verbs, at least one Hebrew text is available for comparison. Since Sirach is the only work in this body of literature to give additional insight into the relationship of ἰλάσκεσθαι words and Hebrew terms,<sup>4</sup> the

<sup>1</sup>Charles, "The Assumption of Moses," CAP, II, 411.

<sup>2</sup>Appendix IV lists all forms of ἰλάσκεσθαι that appear in this body of literature.

<sup>3</sup>For discussion of the other titles sometimes applied to Sirach, see G. H. Box and W. O. E. Oesterley, "Sirach," pp. 368-517 in CAP, I, 270-271.

<sup>4</sup>No other work has early manuscripts available both in Hebrew and in Greek where a member of the ἰλάσκεσθαι group of words is in the Greek manuscript and a corresponding

investigation of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι will begin with its occurrence in Sirach, particularly those where a Hebrew text is also available for examination.

#### a. Hebrew and Greek Words in Sirach

Sirach, originally written in Hebrew between 190 and 170 B.C., was translated into Greek in Egypt shortly after 132 B.C.,<sup>1</sup> and it can be classified as part of the wisdom literature of the Jews. It is interesting too that Box and Oesterley point out that while "traces of Hellenistic influence are

term appears in the Hebrew manuscript. In fact the only other work in all this body of literature where a form of רַכַּח appears is in the text of "Pirke Aboth or Sayings of the Fathers." In the text of this work, edited by Charles Taylor, רַכַּח appears at 5:8 but refers merely to the day of atonement. רַכַּח also appears at 4:28 of Taylor's text, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers Comprising Pirke Aboth in Hebrew and English with Notes and Excursuses, Second Edition, with Additional Notes on a Cairo fragment of Aquila's version of the Old Testament (Cambridge: The University Press, 1897), and at 4:26 of R. Travers Herford's "Pirke Aboth: The Sayings of the Fathers," pp. 686-719, CAP, II, 706, but only as the name of a place. Some manuscripts also contain רַכַּח at 3:10 in Taylor's text (3:9 in Herford's translation), but it is again the name of a place. The work does not advance the study.

<sup>1</sup>Maldwyn Hughes, The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature (London: Robert Culley, n.d.), p. 20.

Andreas Eberharter, Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus (Bonn: Verlag von Peter Hanstein, 1925), VI Band, 5 Abteilung in Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. Übersetzt und Erklärt in Verbindung mit Fachgelehrten. Herausgegeben von Franz Feldmann und Heinr. Herkenne, p. 5, dates the composition between 187 and 171 B.C. and on p. 4 gives the date of translation as 132 B.C. or shortly thereafter.

J. H. A. Hart has dated the work about 310 B.C., but is refuted by W. O. E. Oesterley in The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus in the Revised Version with introduction and notes (Cambridge: University Press, 1912), in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, where the date of the original is given (p. xx) as 190 B.C.

Box and Oesterley, op. cit., p. 292, date it 180-175 B.C.

to be discerned in the book, there is a danger which must be guarded against of seeing them where they do not exist. . . . it is well to be on one's guard, lest what appears to be a Hellenistic note is in reality nothing more than a parallel."<sup>1</sup>

The work is of importance, however, not only because of the number of times forms of *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, occasionally even with Hebrew parallels, appear, but because of its treatment of the subject of atonement.

Oesterley remarks:

This subject is of great interest, both on account of the fulness of the details supplied, and also because the teaching of this book is precisely that found in later Rabbinical literature.<sup>2</sup>

Oesterley also sums up the difference in the Christian and Jewish doctrines of forgiveness when he writes:

It should, however, be pointed out that there is an essential difference between the Jewish and the Christian doctrine here, for according to the former God's forgiveness in a case like this is due to human merit, according to the latter it is of divine grace . . .<sup>3</sup>

Sirach 3:30-31 reads:

30 A flaming fire doth water quench,  
So doth almsgiving atone for (Heb: *נָתַתְּ* ;<sup>4</sup>  
Greek: *ἐξ(λάσεται)* sin.

<sup>1</sup>Box and Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-270.

<sup>2</sup>Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach*, p. lxiv.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. lxvi, in a footnote. Regarding the differences in the doctrine of atonement in Sirach and Christianity, it is noteworthy that Box and Oesterley, "Sirach," *CAP*, I, 294-296, in citing similarities between Sirach and Christian writings, cite none from Paul or John, and the majority are related to James.

<sup>4</sup>The Hebrew text used is that of Hermann L. Strack (ed.), *Die Sprüche Jesus', des Sohnes Sirachs, Der jüngst gefundene hebräische Text mit Anmerkungen und Wörterbuch. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin, Nr. 31* (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1903).



31 He that doeth good, it shall meet him on his ways,  
And when he tottereth he shall find a stay.

The idea that the almsgiving is able to serve as a

כִּפּוּר or ransom for the person giving them is also seen in Sirach 3:14.<sup>1</sup> Both כִּפּוּר and ἑξιλάσεται have the connotation of propitiation. God's attitude is considered so changed by this good work that not only are sins atoned for, expiated, or covered, but God shall reward the person for his good deed.

Sirach 45:16, referring to God's choosing Aaron to serve as high priest, states:

He chose him out of all living,  
To bring near the burnt-offering and fat pieces,  
And to burn a sweet savour and a memorial,  
And make atonement (Heb.: כִּפּוּר ;  
Greek: ἑξιλάσκεισθαι ) for the children of Israel.

That having atonement made for one stands as the alternative to the destroying wrath of God is made clear in 45:19 where God is angered at the men of Dathan and Abiram and the congregation of Korah for envying Aaron "And consumed them in His fierce wrath."

However, not only are God's subjective feeling of anger and his objective manifestation of his wrath indicated, but it is indicated that the high priest Aaron served as a mediator to intercede for the children of Israel and saved them

---

<sup>1</sup>Box and Oesterley, *op. cit.*, I, 325-327, quote from Baba bathra 10a in the Babylonian Talmud where alms are a mediator and save from hell.

It appears, too, that the atoning act of almsgiving is an act of man, not God. Even if the view was, as Oesterley, in The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, p. 26, cites from Baba bathra 10a, that God placed the poor on earth in order to save the rich from hell, the critical act of giving alms was done by man.

from God's wrath. The language here, too, indicates a reconciliation between God and the children of Israel as the main objective rather than as an expiation of their sins, i.e., Aaron makes atonement for the children of Israel.

The designation of Aaron to serve as a mediator to effect atonement between God and the children of Israel is ultimately the result of God's gracious initiative. God chose Aaron; neither was Aaron elected nor was the sacrificial system devised by men. Aaron makes atonement, effects reconciliation, averts the wrath of God on behalf of the children of Israel as their mediator, but he was chosen by God. Since this section, Sirach 45:6-22, is concerned with praising Aaron, this indication of the wrath and gracious initiative of God in enabling the Israelites to avoid his wrath is the more important.

Sirach 23:26 is in praise of Phinehas and sets him alongside Moses and Aaron as v. 23 states:

Moreover Phinehas the son of Eleazar  
 Was glorious in might as a third,  
 In that he was jealous for the God of all,  
 And stood in the breach for his people;  
 While his heart prompted him.  
 And he made atonement (Heb.: ויכפר ;  
 Greek: ἐξήλασεν ) for the children of Israel.

The story as presented in Numbers 25:6-18 is one of the clearest and crudest instances of man, on his own initiative, propitiating God by performing a certain act and thus turning away the anger of God. There is nothing here to indicate any changed circumstances of the story; in fact the same form of the same Greek verb is used here as in Num. 25:13.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See discussion, pp. 30-31, where Num. 25:13 is discussed and also Ps. 106(LXX 105):30 and its discussion, p. 33-34.

In Sirach 5:5-6 both ἔξιλασμός and ἔξιλάσκεσθαι appear with the corresponding forms of פלס :

Count not upon forgiveness (Heb.: פלס ;  
Gk.: ἔξιλασμός),  
That thou shouldst add sin to sin.  
And say not, "His mercies are great,  
He will forgive (Heb.: פלס ; Gk.: ἔξιλάσεται)  
the multitude of mine iniquities";  
For mercy and wrath are with Him,  
And his indignation abideth upon the ungodly.

It is interesting that prior to the discovery of the Hebrew manuscripts, Edersheim conjectured the Hebrew behind the Greek verb was פלס.<sup>1</sup>

That the Hebrew presents a shade of meaning different from the Greek is shown by Box and Oesterley, who render the Hebrew: "He will forgive," yet in the footnotes observe the Greek has the usage: "He will be pacified."<sup>2</sup> While פלס is the usual Hebrew term behind ἔξιλάσκεσθαι, פלס has

<sup>1</sup>A. Edersheim, "Ecclesiasticus," pp. 1-239 in The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611) with an explanation and critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, Vol. II, edited by Henry Wace, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1888), p. 56.

It is more difficult to explain why Dodd, in The Bible and the Greeks, p. 85, indicates פלס is the Hebrew behind ἔξιλάσεται since the Hebrew texts were available at the time of his writing. Both Hebrew texts for this portion of Sirach published by Strack, op. cit., p. 3, read פלס. And the editions of the text published by S. Schecter and C. Taylor (editors), The Wisdom of Ben Sira, portions of the Book Ecclesiasticus from the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah collection presented to the University of Cambridge by the Editors (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), p. 43; p. 4 of Hebrew Text; by Israel Levi, The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus (Leiden: the late E. J. Brill, 1904), p. 5; and Rudolf Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach Hebräisch und Deutsch (Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1906), p. 4; all give the same text as Strack.

<sup>2</sup>Box and Oesterley, op. cit., in loc.



already occurred in the Old Testament as the occasional basis of *ἐλάσκεισθαι*.<sup>1</sup> This instance might be taken to emphasize the idea that *ἐλάσκεισθαι* words were not exactly synonymous with *רָחוּם* words and, if anything, had a broader meaning.<sup>2</sup> A form of *ἐλάσκεισθαι* might also have been used in this instance since the reader, in this context, is being warned not to rely too much on God's forgiving him, and is reminded that God can show wrath as well as mercy.

In Sirach 16:7 *ἐξιλάσατο* is used to render *נָשָׂא*, and here again the emphasis is on the fact that God does not always forgive; the point is rather that God does exercise his wrath on occasion:

He forgave (Heb.: *נָשָׂא*; Gk.: *ἐξιλάσατο*) not the  
princes of old,  
Who revolted in their might.

And in Sirach 16:11, where God's forgiveness is again spoken of, it is again spoken of with the thought of his wrath in the background, indeed in the foreground also, in contrast to forgiveness:

Yea, and if there be one who is stiff-necked,  
A marvel it would be were he not punished.  
For mercy and wrath are with Him,  
He forgiveth and pardoneth (Hebrew: *נָשָׂא וְנָקָה*;  
Greek: *δυναστος ἐξιλασμων*), but upon the  
wicked He causeth His wrath to rest.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See p. 42 ff.

<sup>2</sup>In every instance of *רָחוּם* in Sirach, the Greek has some form of *ἐλάσκεισθαι* to render it out of the Hebrew. That *ἐλάσκεισθαι* also is used to render other Hebrew terms would indicate its broader usage.

<sup>3</sup>Box and Oesterley, *op. cit.*, I, 372, translate the Greek, "He is mighty to forgive."

Edwin Cone Bissell, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with historical introductions, a revised translation, and*

These instances,<sup>1</sup> which are the only instances in Sirach where a member of the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group has a Hebrew text and corresponding word for study, indicate that the group is not synonymous with the *רָצַח* group but is more closely related to it than any other Hebrew family of words.<sup>2</sup> It is used to indicate the giving of a ransom, a crude act of propitiating God by man, a procedure of avoiding the wrath of God instituted by God, and God's forgiving--though with the idea of wrath also present by way of contrast, alternative, or threat. It is used where the initiative is with God and also with man. The verb indicates an act that by some means, alms-giving, priestly ritual, or killing a malefactor, God manifests graciousness rather than wrath towards the people. The noun indicates the forgiveness of God as contrasted with his wrath, i.e., a propitious attitude.

b. Other Instances of *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι*

In Sirach 3:3 the reading is:

---

notes critical and explanatory, in A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with special reference to Ministers and Students, by John Peter Lange, translated, revised, enlarged, and edited by Philip Schaff, Vol. XV. (Note: This work does not appear in the German edition.) (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880). Bissell observes on p. 323 that the literal translation of the Greek is: "Lord of appeasings, atonements."

<sup>1</sup>Sirach 3:30, 45:16, and 45:23, where *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* is used to render some form of *רָצַח*.

Sirach 5:6, where *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* renders *פָּלַח*.

Sirach 16:7, where *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* renders *נָשַׁח*,

and also Sirach 5:5, where *ἐξιλασμός* renders *הַפְּלִיחַ*, and Sirach 16:11, where *ἐξιλασμός* renders *הַפְּלִיחַ*.

<sup>2</sup>Every instance of *רָצַח* is rendered in the Greek version with a form of the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group of words. But the reverse is not true.

He that honoureth his father maketh atonement (ἐξιλάσκεται) for sins.<sup>1</sup>

Again the idea of good works as compensating for sins occurs almost as though being weighed against them on a balance.<sup>2</sup> The idea is less personal than that of propitiation; it is rather one of expiation, but man has the initiative in working out his salvation.

The present tense of the verb again appears in 34:19. Here the question is the voice of the verb since it can be taken either as middle or passive. The verse, which also presents a noble view regarding sacrifices and implies that the situation was such that correction was needed, reads:

The Most High hath no pleasure in the offerings of the ungodly;  
Neither is he pacified for sins (ἐξιλάσκεται ἁμαρτίας) by the multitude of sacrifices.<sup>3</sup>

The verb is taken in the middle by Box and Oesterley, who translate the Greek, "Neither doth he forgive sins . . ."<sup>4</sup> Yet the fact that God's pleasure is mentioned in the first

<sup>1</sup>Both manuscript evidence and scholars are divided as to whether ἐξιλάσκεται in the present tense or ἐξιλάσεται is to be preferred. Codices A and S, corrected, favor the present tense. Codices B and S, original, favor the future tense. The tense does not affect the meaning.

<sup>2</sup>Box and Oesterley, op. cit., p. 325, comment on v. 14: "The son's righteous act in succouring his aged father is written down to his credit, and thus counterbalances his sins: cp. Qiddushim 40b (Talmud Babli.), where it is said a man is judged 'according to that which balances,' i.e., according to whether the weight of sins or of good deeds weighs heavier; . . ."

<sup>3</sup>The Apocrypha translated out of the Greek and Latin Tongues, being the version set forth A.D. 1611 compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1894 (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, n.d.), in loc.

<sup>4</sup>Box and Oesterley, op. cit., in loc.



part of the verse gives a preference for the English Revised Version with the idea of propitiation, placation, pacification, accomplished by man or attempted accomplishment by man.

Such being the case, while Sirach denies that God can be placated in such manner, the usage of the verb itself, apart from the negatives in the sentence,<sup>1</sup> would indicate the verb was being used in a way sometimes termed only to exist in "secular" Greek.

In Sirach 20:28b the statement is: "He that pleaseth (ὁ ἀρέσκων) the great atoneth (ἐξιλάσεται) for wrong." The statement concerns the relationships among men, but the relationship between ἐξιλάσκεσθαι and ἀρέσκω, which in addition to the usage of "please" also has the usage of "satisfy," "conciliate," and even "appease,"<sup>2</sup> is very close.

In Sirach 28:5 ἐξιλάσεται appears but adds little to the study of the word since it could be given several usages. The English Revised Version gives the general translation, "shall make atonement for."<sup>3</sup> The section of Sirach, 27:30-28:7, in which this verse falls, however, is noteworthy for its teaching that a person must be merciful towards his neighbor if he expects mercy from God.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Apart from the οὐκ and the οὐδὲ.

<sup>2</sup>LSGL, p. 238a.

<sup>3</sup>Box and Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 408, *in loc.*, give the reading: "will make atonement for."

<sup>4</sup>Compare especially Sirach 28:2 with Matt. 6:14, 15; 18:35; Mark 11:25. Here Christ's teaching is seen to have a Hebrew ancestor. Though some scholars have said v. 2 is a Christian interpolation, Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach*, pp. 178-179, and Box and Oesterley, *op. cit.*,

In the Septuagint version<sup>1</sup> of The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children, v. 17, or Dan. 3:40, ἐξιλάσαι, the aorist imperative middle (not passive) form appears, and is rightly rendered by Bennett, "make thou atonement." There is no thought of man propitiating God; God is the actor. Yet the thought seems to be that if God does not make atonement, the children will be destroyed in the fiery furnace.

In The Psalms of Solomon,<sup>2</sup> a form of ἱλάσκεσθαι appears once, in 3:9:

He maketh atonement (ἐξιλάσατο for (sins of) ignorance by fasting and afflicting his soul,  
And the Lord counteth guiltless every pious man and his house.<sup>3</sup>

It is the Lord who counts guiltless (καθαρίζει), but this counting guiltless by the Lord seems to presuppose the man's having already fasted and afflicted his soul. While this instance does not advance the study very much, it is noteworthy that the man who does not ἐξιλάσατο περὶ ἀγνοίας, but rather adds sins to sins, shall be destroyed (3:11-15).

In most manuscripts of The Testament of Levi in The

---

I, 408, refute such a claim by citing several other Jewish statements in the same line of thought.

<sup>1</sup>Even as in Daniel, the LXX version and Theodotion's version never contain a form of ἱλάσκεσθαι at the same place, so also in this addition to Daniel, Theodotion's version, which is usually followed, does not contain a form of ἱλάσκεσθαι. Consequently, W. H. Bennett's suggestion in his introduction to "The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children" in CAP, I, 627, that "Theodotion and the LXX are so similar that they are clearly texts of the same Greek text" is interesting.

<sup>2</sup>G. B. Gray, in CAP, II, 625, dates the work in the middle of the first century B.C.

<sup>3</sup>This is the translation given in CAP.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs<sup>1</sup> ἑξιλασκόμενοι appears in 3:5 regarding the angels or archangels who minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous. Yet, though Charles uses the phrase "make propitiation" to render the Greek, God's wrath is not spoken of, and there is no implication that the procedure is one of placation. The angels appear as intercessors, but only for certain sins of certain people. The word seems to be used in a semi-technical sense, and this instance does not advance the study very much.

The last two instances of ἑξιλάσκεσθαι appear in The

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles, in GAP, II, 282, regards the work as having been written between 109 and 106 B.C. and notes several signs of influence on the New Testament, pp. 291-294, and similarities are cited regarding the teaching on forgiveness, universalism, and the Messiah.

Regarding forgiveness, Charles writes, p. 293: "It shows that pre-Christian Judaism possessed a noble system of ethics on the subject of forgiveness. By the early school of the Hesidim, or the pious ones of the Psalms, the best elements of the Old Testament had been taken up, studied and developed, and the highly ethical code of conduct deduced therefrom had been carried out in actual life by these ancient Quietists. But when Pharisaism, breaking with the ancient ideals of its party, committed itself to political interests and movements, and concurrently therewith surrendered itself more and more wholly to the study of the letter of the Law, it soon ceased to offer scope for the further development of such a lofty system of ethics as the Testaments attest, and so the true successors of the early Hasids and their teaching quitted Judaism and found their natural home in the bosom of primitive Christianity.

However, M. de Jonge in The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, A Study of their Text, Composition, and Origin (Assen, Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum and Comp. N. V., 1953) explains this similarity on the basis that (p. 117): "They (the Testaments) must be classified among the literary products of the early Christian Church and may perhaps shed new light on the history of the Church in the first two or three centuries of its existence."



Letter of Aristeas, written by a Jew of Alexandria<sup>1</sup> between 130 and 70 B.C.<sup>2</sup> At one point the work implies that God is never angry: "God rules the whole world in the spirit of kindness and without wrath at all (v. 245). At another point he states that evil as well as good comes from God, though God gives power to endure (v. 197).

However, in verses 314-316<sup>3</sup> it is evident that God can be provoked to wrath and will manifest such wrath in concrete

<sup>1</sup>Henry St. John Thackeray, "Translation of the Letter of Aristeas," pp. 337-391 in The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XV, No. 59, April, 1903, p. 337.

And also H. T. Andrews, "The Letter of Aristeas," pp. 83-122, CAP, II, 84.

<sup>2</sup>Paul Wendland, "Der Aristeasbrief," pp. 1-31 in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, Zweiter Band, übersetzt und Herausgegeben E. Kautzsch, 2 vols. (Tübingen, Freiburg i.B. und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900), p. 3, dates it between 96 and 63 B.C.

Thackeray, op. cit., pp. 338-340, discusses the views of Schürer (about 200 B.C.) of Willrich (after 33 A.D.) and of Wendland, and tends to agree with Wendland.

Andrews, op. cit., p. 87, dates the work except for #128-71 between 130 and 70 B.C.

Moses Hadas (editor and translator), in Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas) (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 55, dates it shortly after 132 B.C.

<sup>3</sup>(v. 314) For he said that he had heard Theopompus tell how when he was too rashly intending to introduce into his history some of the incidents from the law which had previously been translated, his mind was deranged for more than thirty days. And when the disorder abated he besought God (Gk.: ἐξέλασθεσθαι τὸν θεόν) that the cause of the mischance might be made plain to him. (v. 315) And when it was shown him in a dream that his desire to disclose the things of God to common men was misguided, he desisted, and thereupon recovered his reason. (v. 316) 'And I have been informed by Theodectes, the tragic poet, that when he was intending to introduce into one of his plays something recorded in the Book, he was afflicted with cataract of the eyes: and suspecting that this was the reason for his mishap, he besought God's mercy (Gr.: ἐξέλασάμενος τὸν θεόν), and after many days recovered his sight.' (Thackeray's translation.)

ways. Ἐξιλάσκεισθαι occurs twice in these verses, each time with the afflicted person the subject of the action and God the object. Moreover, after the action designated by Ἐξιλάσκεισθαι, God treats the afflicted person in a more propitious manner.

When Josephus relates this story,<sup>1</sup> he also uses a form of Ἐξιλάσκεισθαι corresponding to Ἐξιλάσκεισθαι in verse 314. In the part of his narrative which corresponds to verse 316, he uses a form of ἔξευμενίσω instead of Ἐξιλάσκεισθαι. The only usage which Liddell and Scott give for ἔξευμενίσω is "propitiate."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Antiquities of the Jews, Book XII, Ch. 2. Instead of Ἐξιλάσκεισθαι, Josephus has Ἐξιλάσκετο. Where The Letter of Aristeeas has Ἐξιλασάμενος Josephus has ἔξευμενισάμενος. See LvdoVICI Mendelssohn and PavlvS Wendland, Aristee ad Philocratem Epistvla Cvm Ceteris de Origine Versionis LXX Interpretvm Testimoniis (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1900), p. 118. And compare Ralph Marcus, Josephus with an English Translation, in Nine Volumes, Vol. VII, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII-XIV (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1943) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Farmington (hereafter abbreviated LCL), pp. 56-57. He renders Ἐξιλάσκετο by a form of "appease" and ἔξευμενισάμενος with a form of "propitiate."

William Whiston renders both these Greek verbs with forms of the verb "appease" in his translation, The Whole Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, the learned and authentic Jewish historian, and celebrated warrior; translated from the original Greek according to Havercamp's accurate edition. Containing: I, Twenty books of the Jewish Antiquities: with the life of Josephus, written by himself; II, Seven books of the Jewish War; III, Two books against Apion; IV, An extract out of Josephus' exhortation to the Greeks, concerning hades, and the resurrection of the dead, Together with large notes, proper observations, and an index, To which are added, three dissertations, concerning, I. The testimonies of Josephus vindicated, II. God's command to Abraham to offer up Isaac, his son, for a sacrifice, III. Tacitus' accounts of the origin of the Jewish nation, and of the particulars of the last Jewish war, with a complete table of the Jewish coins, weights, and measures, 4 vols. (Glasgow: Blackie & Son, n.d.).

<sup>2</sup>LSGL, p. 592.

In the great majority of instances considered,

ἐξιλάσκεσθαι is concerned with a situation where relief is sought from the manifestation of human or divine wrath, or where there is a desire to avoid such wrath. In more than one instance, the subject of this propitiation is man, and the object is God.

## 2. Ἐξιλασμός

In I Esdras,<sup>1</sup> which for the most part is a series of parallels to parts of II Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the one instance of ἐξιλασμός is in 9:20:

And they gave their hands to put away their wives, and to offer rang to make reconciliation (Gk.: ἐξιλασμόν) for their error.

Reconciliation, indicating the action of the verb "reconcile" with the usage "to cause to be friendly again; to bring back to harmony,"<sup>3</sup> is obviously close akin to propitiation, which indicates the action of "propitiate" with the usage "to appease and render favourable; conciliate."<sup>4</sup> The translators have rendered the word and thought into English in good fashion, for in I Esdras 9:13 it is indicated that the people

---

<sup>1</sup>A. C. Zenos, "Books of Esdras," pp. 226-228 in SBD, p. 227: "... the date of the original I Es. (i.e., the Heb. or Aramaic original) can only be conjectured. The book was translated into Greek before Josephus used it and perhaps before the beginning of the Christian era. More than this cannot be said with certainty."

S. A. Cook, "I Esdras," pp. 1-58, GAP, I, 5, indicates it must have been written "some time after 333 B.C."

<sup>2</sup>Translation of the English Revised Version and followed by Cook.

<sup>3</sup>Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, op. cit., in loc.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., in loc.



are under the wrath of God and that by putting away strange wives they hope to "turn away the wrath of the Lord from us for this matter."<sup>1</sup> Man is the actor; God is the object of the act; to change God's attitude toward the people from one of wrath to graciousness is the purpose of the act, and the putting away of the strange wives is the means of reconciling or propitiating God.

II Maccabees, which was probably written in the first century B.C.,<sup>2</sup> contains ἑξίλασμός once, in 12:45. Beginning at 12:32 the battle of the Jews under Judas against Gorgias is related. Judas and the Jews prevail (12:36-37), and when they go out to pick up their dead comrades, "they discovered under the shirts of every one of the dead men amulets of the idols of Jamnia" (12:40). Verses 41-43a describe Judas as making invocation for the dead idolatrous Jews. Verses 43b-44 are an apologetic for Judas in making a sacrifice for the dead,<sup>3</sup> and verse 45b sums up the matter:

---

<sup>1</sup>Esdras 9:13 is parallel to Ezra 10:14, which reads: "Let now our princes be appointed for all the congregation, and let all them that are in our cities which have married strange women come at appointed times, and with them the elders of every city, and the judges thereof, until the fierce wrath of our God be turned from us, until this matter be dispatched."

<sup>2</sup>C. C. Torrey, "Maccabees (Books)," (cols. 2857-2886) in EB, Vol. III, col. 2874, dates the work "near the close of the last century B.C."

Bissell, op. cit., p. 560, dates it between 125 B.C. and A.D. 70.

Fairweather, "II Maccabees," pp. 187-196 in DBT, III, 191, dates it between 160 B.C. and A.D. 40.

James Moffatt, "The Second Book of Maccabees," pp. 125-175, in CAR, I, 128, well states: "The date of the epitome, and inferentially of Jason, cannot be fixed except within approximate limits."

<sup>3</sup>Carl Ludwig Wilibald Grimm, Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer, in Kurzfassendes exegetisches Handbuch zu

"Hence he made propitiation (τὸν ἑξίλασμον) for the dead, that they might be released from their sin."<sup>1</sup>

The evidence is clear that in the mind of the author these Israelites were killed because their idolatry had provoked God to wrath. Judas is trying, by both prayer and ritual, to change God's attitude towards them so that in the day of future resurrection and judgment they may also receive "the gracious reward which is reserved for those who have fallen asleep in godliness."<sup>2</sup>

Sirach<sup>3</sup> contains some four instances<sup>4</sup> of ἑξίλασμός in addition to the two instances already considered, together with their Hebrew counterparts.<sup>5</sup>

---

den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, Vierte Lieferung (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1857), pp. 184-186, gives a good discussion of this passage and critique on both some Protestant and Roman Catholic interpretations. However, while Grimm feels that an offering for the dead must have been common in the time of the author, it is felt that Moffatt, op. cit., p. 150, rightly observes: "The sacrifice for the dead is recounted in such a way as to suggest that the writer anticipated not unnaturally, objections to it on the score of novelty."

<sup>1</sup>This is the translation printed by Moffatt in CAP. The English Revised Version also reads propitiation, while Bissell, op. cit., p. 703, reads "reconciliation" and so also G. Rawlinson, "II Maccabees," pp. 539-648, in The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611) with an explanatory and critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, Vol. II, edited by Henry Wace, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1898). p. 603.

<sup>2</sup>II Macc. 12:45 states he made propitiation for the dead so that they might be released from their sin. But more than expiation is involved, also propitiation and reconciliation. It is clear that not being released from their sin means they will continue to endure the wrath of God that caused them to be killed in battle because of their idolatry.

<sup>3</sup>See p. 86 for a discussion of the date and general nature of Sirach.

<sup>4</sup>Sirach 17:29; 18:12; 18:20; 35:3.

<sup>5</sup>See p. 90 for a discussion of ἑξίλασμός in Sirach 5:5 and p. 91 for a discussion of ἑξίλασμός in Sirach 16:11.

In Sirach 17:29 the statement is:

How great is the mercy of the Lord,  
And His forgiveness (Gk.: ἔξιλασμός) to them that  
turn unto Him."

If this verse were considered alone, ἔξιλασμός, especially standing parallel to "mercy," would clearly have the usage of "forgiveness" or "graciousness." Since, however, 17:15-24 deal with God's recompense to those who serve him, the word is to be taken as conditional on something having been paid or done;<sup>1</sup> it does not, however, mean "propitiation," though it could indicate "propitious attitude," more especially since the section in which this verse occurs (17:25-32) is "an exhortation to turn to God and forsake sin."<sup>2</sup>

In Sirach 18:12 ἔξιλασμός is again rendered by "forgiveness,"<sup>3</sup> and rightly so. There is no mention of God's wrath or of man as doing anything to merit salvation. Bissell accepts the translation of "compassion" and qualifies it by commenting, "the compassion that is easily reconciled;"<sup>4</sup> the emphasis is on the goodness and mercy of God. The word stands here in sharp contrast to its usage in I Esdras 9:20.

In Sirach 18:20 the statement is:

---

<sup>1</sup>Oesterley, The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, in loc., p. 120: "his forgiveness. ἔξιλασμός, lit. 'appeasement' (on this word see further xviii, 20); different from the N.T. word ἄφεσις ('remission'), which has rather the meaning of free pardon, while the former implies conditional forgiveness, i.e., conditional or something having been 'paid' for forgiveness."

<sup>2</sup>Box and Oesterley, in loc., so title it.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., in loc., and also the English RV.

<sup>4</sup>Bissell, op. cit., p. 328.



Before judgement examine thyself,  
And in the hour of visitation thou shalt find forgiveness (ἐξῆλασμόν)."

The advice is prudent. If the reader will examine himself, repent from his evil and do good works, then in the hour of visitation God will find no wrong with him and he shall be accepted.<sup>1</sup> "Forgiveness," ἐξῆλασμός as rendered here, is very definitely predicated on previous examination, and, it is implied, repentance from evil and the performance of good works.

Sirach 35:3 reads:

A thing well-pleasing to the Lord (Gk.: εὐδοκία κυρίου)  
it is to avoid wickedness,  
And a propitiation (Gk.: καὶ ἐξῆλασμός) to avoid  
what is wrong.

The fact that ἐξῆλασμός stands parallel to "a thing well-pleasing to the Lord" strengthens the idea that it is something that pleases God and tends to change his attitude to one of added graciousness. At the same time the high ethical sense in which the word is used should not be forgotten.<sup>2</sup>

The Wisdom of Solomon was written shortly before or after

---

<sup>1</sup>Edersheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-102, observes: "The meaning of the Greek is, that if a man thus makes timely self-examination, and combines with it humiliation and repentance, judgement will not descend upon him."

Victor Ryssel, "Die Sprüche Jesus", des Sohnes Sirachs," pp. 230-475 in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, Erster Band, Übersetzt und Herausgegeben E. Kautzsch, 2 vols., Erster Band (Tübingen, Friburg i.B. und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900), p. 321, in like manner states: "Aussöhnung mit Gott (wörtl. "wirst du finden"). Der Sinn ist: wenn jemand durch Selbstprüfung dazu geführt wird, sich auf das göttliche Gericht vorzubereiten, so wird es ihm nichts anhaben können."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. I Sam. 15:22 "to obey is better than sacrifice, . . ." See also Mic. 6:6-8 and Rom. 12:1.

the birth of Christ.<sup>1</sup> The author shows signs of acquaintance with the literature and philosophy of Greece;<sup>2</sup> Paul in turn shows signs of being acquainted with this work. While Paul's dependence is limited to form rather than to content of argument,<sup>3</sup> the possibility is again presented that certain supposedly Hellenistic aspects of Paul's style may have come through Jewish works.

Ἐξίλασμός is used once (18:21)<sup>4</sup> to describe the propitiation of God by Aaron with prayer and incense.

The text relates how Aaron put an end to the calamity: "Even prayer and the propitiation (Gk.: Ἐξίλασμόν) of incense." To remove any doubt that Ἐξίλασμόν has the usage of propitiation, 18:21 begins, "And he overcame the anger." The anger here, as in the record of the incident in Num. 16:45-50, is that of God.

<sup>1</sup>Samuel Holmes, "The Wisdom of Solomon," pp. 518-568 in CAP, I, 520-521, cites various dates assigned to the work by various scholars ranging from 145 B.C. to 40 A.D. Holmes dates the second section of the work, 11:2-12:22 between 30 B.C. and A.D. 10.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 518.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 525-527; here Holmes also cites certain parallels between The Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Epistle to the Romans, but such parallels never touch on the subject of atonement.

As Sanday and Headlam, Commentary on Romans, ICC, p. 52, comment on Paul's indebtedness to The Wisdom of Solomon, "It did not extend to any of the leading ideas of Christianity, and affected the form rather than the matter of the arguments to which it did extend."

<sup>4</sup>The Wisdom of Solomon 18:20-25 deals with this episode that is also described in Num. 16:44-50; Ἐξίλάσατο occurs in Num. 16:47; see discussion on pp. 30-32, where it is concluded that this instance of Ἐξίλάσκεισθαι in Num. 16:47 has the usage of appease, placate, propitiate, and that man is the subject and God the object.

Except for some passages in Sirach, ἐξιλασμός therefore, appears in every instance in this body of literature with the idea of propitiation. In some of the instances of Sirach, the word has the usage of "forgiveness," but forgiveness which is conditional on some act of man, although in some instances in Sirach, especially 19:12, the emphasis is on the undeserved graciousness of God. While, then, a uniform usage of the word is not found, it has in the majority of instances the usage of "propitiation."

### 3. ἑλάσκεισθαι

In The Additions to Esther, Addition C:10,<sup>1</sup> ἑλάσκεισθαι appears once. This verse is part of the prayer of Mordecai:

Hearken to my prayer, and be gracious (Greek: ἑλάσθητι) unto Thine heritage; and turn our mourning into feasting, that we may live and sing Thy Name, O Lord; and destroy not the mouth of them that praise Thee.

In verse 11 there is added: "And all Israel cried out with their might, for their death was before their eyes."<sup>2</sup> The verb, aorist passive imperative, can also be translated "be propitiated." But regardless of the word used to render it into English, the idea is evident that the Jews are under

---

<sup>1</sup>J. A. F. Gregg, "The Additions to Esther" pp. 665-684 in GAP, I, 665, remarks: "The Additions to Esther consist of six passages (containing 107 verses not in the Hebrew text), inserted in the LXX text by way of amplification of subjects referred to in the canonical chapters." In Rahlfs' edition of the Septuaginta, the verse containing ἑλάσκεισθαι is marked 4:17h.

<sup>2</sup>The text is that given by Gregg. The English Revised Version is very similar, except that ἑλάσθητι is rendered "be merciful."



the manifestation of the wrath of God, afraid of death, and that Mordecai is praying for God to show a more gracious, merciful, propitious attitude. That God at this time was angry with the Jews is plainly stated in C:17, where Esther prays: "And now we have sinned before Thee, and Thou hast delivered us into the hands of our enemies, because we have given glory to their gods."<sup>1</sup>

In the group of Sibylline Oracles, considered by Lanchester to be of Jewish origin,<sup>2</sup> ἱλάσκεσθαι appears twice in Book III, dated about 140 B.C.,<sup>3</sup> and once in Book IV, dated about 80 A.D.<sup>4</sup>

Book III, lines 624-632, read:

(24) But thou, O man of wiles, tarry not with hesitation, (25) but turning round again make intercession (Greek: ἱλάσκοιο) to God. (26) Sacrifice to God hundreds of bulls and firstling lambs (27) and of goats in the circling seasons. (28) Yea, make intercession (Greek: ἱλάσκου) to Him, the Immortal God, if perchance He may have mercy upon thee. (29) For He alone is God, and there is none beside. (30) Honour righteousness and oppress no man: (31) for these are the commands of the Eternal to wretched mortals.

---

<sup>1</sup>These prayers of Mordecai and Esther in some ways resemble the prayer of Moses for the people in Ex. 32:30 ff.

<sup>2</sup>H. C. O. Lanchester, "The Sibylline Oracles," pp. 368-406 in CAP, II, so considers the fragments preserved in Theophilus' ad Autolyicum and in Books III, IV, and V. See CAP, pp. 368-374.

<sup>3</sup>Lanchester, op. cit., p. 372: "Taking the book as a whole there is no adequate reason for doubting that lines 98-819 are, with the exception of a few passages (e.g., 350-5, 467-9, 776) either composed or incorporated by a Jew, probably living in Egypt about 140 B.C."

The two instances in Book III are in lines 625 and 628.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 373, Lanchester comments on Book IV: "So by general consent the book is ascribed to about the year 80 A.D."

(32) But do thou beware of the wrath of the mighty God, . . . .<sup>1</sup>

Here in the second century B.C. *ἐλάσκεσθαι* is used in a Jewish writing where man is encouraged to endeavour to propitiate God by means of sacrifices and good works, "perchance He may have mercy upon thee," this injunction to propitiate God being followed by the warning, "beware of the wrath of the mighty God." Good works and sacrifices are apparently considered as a means whereby man may perhaps induce God to be merciful and may thus avoid his wrath.<sup>2</sup>

The instance in Book IV, contemporaneous with much of the literature of the New Testament, seems to sound a somewhat stronger note of propitiation. After stating that when "faith in godliness shall perish from men (152)," God will no more be merciful but will gnash His teeth in wrath and destroy all men (see ll. 159-161), the author begins a plea for repentance and good works, which reads in part:

(166) and, stretching your hands to heaven, seek forgiveness for your former deeds, (167) and with praises ask pardon for your bitter ungodliness (Greek: καὶ εὐλογίας ἀσέβειαν πικρὰν ἐλάσκεσθε ). God

---

<sup>1</sup>The Greek is cited from the text of Joh. Geffcken, Die Oracula Sibyllina, Bearbeitet im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902), in Die Griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte Herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, p. 80.

<sup>2</sup>Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literaturen, 4th ed. (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1952), col. 680, lists these two instances in the Sibylline Oracles as examples of where *ἐλάσκομαι* has the usage of "versöhnen, gnädig machen."

will grant repentance (169) and will not slay: He will stay his wrath once more if with one accord (170) ye practice precious godliness in your hearts.

If they refuse, they are told, "He shall burn everything out . . . 178)."

Praise, repentance, and a godliness of heart are all noble qualities, and the endeavour to avoid the wrath of God is on a high moral plane. But the fact is evident that they are considered by the author as a way to avoid the wrath of God which will otherwise befall them. Since "bitter ungodliness" is not preceded by a preposition in the Greek, the sentence might read, "and with praises expiate your bitter ungodliness." Yet, however the verb may be translated, it indicates an attempt to avoid the wrath of God, propitiation being an element in such an attempt.

In each of these four instances of ἐλάσκεσθαι in Jewish works written in the two centuries before and the first century after Christ, the usage of the verb has man as the subject, God as the object, with the use of prayers, good works, or sacrifices to avoid the otherwise certain wrath of God, i.e., the usage is one of propitiation.

#### 4. ἑλασμός

ἑλασμός appears once in this body of literature, in II Macc. 3:33.<sup>1</sup> Heliodorus, the chancellor of the king (3:7), comes to Jerusalem to remove deposits of money and to take

---

<sup>1</sup>See discussion on p. 100 for a discussion of the date of II Maccabees.



them back to the king (3:7 ff.). He is prevented from doing this, is scourged by a manifestation of God's displeasure (3:22-30), and nearly dies (3:31). At this point 3:32-33 read:

(32) And the high priest, secretly fearing lest the king might come to think that some treachery toward Heliodorus had been perpetrated by the Jews, brought a sacrifice for the deliverance of the man. (33) But as the high priest was making the propitiation (Greek: τὸν ἑλασμὸν) the same young men appeared again to Heliodorus, arrayed in the same garments; and they stood and said, Give Onias the high priest great thanks, for for his sake the Lord hath granted thee life; . . .<sup>1</sup>

Rawlinson also renders the Greek with "the propitiation," noting that "he was offering the sacrifice which was to expiate Heliodorus's crime."<sup>2</sup> Such a comment shows how intimately "propitiation" and "expiation" can, on occasion, be related. By expiating the sin, the high priest hoped to persuade God to be more propitious to Heliodorus and not kill him.

The latter part of v. 33 shows that it achieved its purpose. It is interesting that Rawlinson, Moffatt, and the English Revised Version all render the Greek with "propitiation" or "sacrifice of propitiation" and not "expiation," and they are correct. Even though the immediate purpose was to expiate the sin, the ultimate purpose was to propitiate God so that Heliodorus would not die and the king would not take revenge on the Jews.

---

<sup>1</sup>This is the translation of the English Revised Version. Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 136, translates τὸν ἑλασμὸν as "the sacrifice of propitiation."

<sup>2</sup>G. Rawlinson, "II Maccabees," *in loc.*

Thus, while ἑλασμός in the Old Testament had a wide range of usages,<sup>1</sup> in its one occurrence in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, it has the usage of "instrument of propitiation." While a trend in development cannot be proved by one instance, this instance in II Maccabees is noteworthy. It is felt, moreover, that "propitiation" or "instrument of propitiation" as given by the English Revised Version and Rawlinson are more accurate translations than Moffatt's "sacrifice of propitiation." The usage in the Old Testament attests to the general character of the word. As the text states and as the English Revised Version indicates, the high priest offered a sacrifice, and in this instance that sacrifice was the means or instrument of propitiation. But ἑλασμός of itself, in the face of the Old Testament usage, cannot be construed as having the usage "sacrifice of propitiation."

### 5. ἑλαστής

ἑλαστής appears only once in this body of literature, and that instance is supported by very poor textual evidence. In I Esdras 8:53<sup>2</sup> the English Revised Version reads:

And again we besought our Lord as touching these things, and found him favourable unto us,

which is a good translation of the Greek text as given in Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint: καὶ πάλιν ἐδεήθημεν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν κατὰ ταῦτα καὶ εὐχάριστον ἐτύχομεν.

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 48-53.

<sup>2</sup>See p. 99 for a discussion of this work.

While Rahlfs does give some variant readings for this verse, he does not mention ἑλαστής. Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, however, do indicate that a corrected version of Codex A has ἑλαστοῦ instead of ἐνὶ ἑλάτῳ.<sup>1</sup> It is possible to take this as meaning "and we found him a propitiator" with the idea that, instead of the soldiers that the Jews were too proud to request, God would be their protector (8:50-52). However, in view of the manuscript evidence, Liddell and Scott are probably correct in regarding this as merely a false reading.<sup>2</sup>

### ε. ἑλεως

ἑλεως appears nine times in this body of literature,<sup>3</sup> the first instance being I. Macc. 2:21. I Maccabees, however, is not concerned with the propitiation either of God or of men,<sup>4</sup> and ἑλεως in this instance has a deprecatory

<sup>1</sup>Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, op. cit., Vol. II, Part 4, p. 593, in loc.

<sup>2</sup>LSGL, p. 828, in loc.

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix IV for tabulations listed under the various words. Appendix IV, Section A, sub-section 6, deals with ἑλεως. The nine instances are: I Macc. 2:21; II Macc. 2:7, 22; 7:37; 10:26; IV Macc. 6:28; 8:14; 9:24; and 12:18.

<sup>4</sup>Bissell, op. cit., p. 479, dates it between 106 B.C. and 64 B.C.; Oesterley, in "The First Book of Maccabees," pp. 59-124, CAP, I, 60; Hughes, op. cit., p. 20; W. Fairweather and J. Sutherland Black, in The First Book of Maccabees with introduction and notes, in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: The University Press, 1897), p. 43, and Carl Ludwig Wilibald Grimm, Das erste buch der Maccabäer, in Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, Dritte Lieferung (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853), p. xxv, have similar dates.

A different view is proposed by Solomon Zeitlin in The First Book of Maccabees, translated by Sidney Tedeschi with Introduction and Commentary by Solomon Zeitlin (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 32: "I Maccabees, then, is a compilation of two parts. . . . The two portions were combined into one book during the first decade after the destruction of the Temple."



usage<sup>1</sup> already met with in some instances in the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> It does not advance the study.

In II Maccabees<sup>3</sup> the first of the four instances in this work is at 2:7. The story records that while Jeremiah was hiding the tabernacle, the ark, and the altar of incense, he found that he was being followed. Verse 7 states:

But when Jeremiah perceived it, he blamed them, saying, Yea and the place shall be unknown until God gather the people again together, and mercy come (καὶ ἔλθῃ γένηται):<sup>4</sup>

Whether this translation is followed, or whether "and become propitious"<sup>5</sup> or "receive them into mercy"<sup>6</sup> is accepted, the point is that the gathering of the people will be an outward manifestation that God is no longer wrathful; he has been propitiated and is gracious toward the children of Israel.

Grimm, moreover, notes that the usage of ἔλθῃ in this and every instance in II Maccabees is the same as in classical Greek.<sup>7</sup>

In II Macc. 2:22 the term appears in the preface, describing the deeds of Judas Maccabaeus:

---

Oesterley, "The First Book of Maccabees," CAP, I, 59, rightly observes: "The narrative is, with few exceptions, written in chronological order, and is concerned almost wholly with military events."

<sup>1</sup>Both the English Revised Version and the text in CAP read "Heaven forbid."

<sup>2</sup>For a discussion of these instances, see p. 56.

<sup>3</sup>See p. 100 for discussion of date of II Maccabees.

<sup>4</sup>The English Revised Version.

<sup>5</sup>In the text commented on by Bissell, op. cit., in loc.

<sup>6</sup>Given by Bissell, op. cit., in loc., in his notes.

<sup>7</sup>Grimm, Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer, p. 52: "ἔλθῃ (att. statt ἔλαος) von der Güte und ver-söhnten Gnade Gottes auch Vs. 22. 7, 37. 10, 26; in demselben Sinne bei den Classikern sehr gangbar von den Göttern."

And (Judas) recovered again the temple renowned all the world over, and freed the city and restored the laws which were like to be overthrown, seeing the Lord became gracious unto them with all forbearance (τοῦ κυρίου μετὰ πάσης ἐπιεικείας ἔλεω γενομένου αὐτοῦ):<sup>1</sup>

Again ἔλεως has the usage of "gracious," "propitious," or "favorable." The text also implies that prior to the Lord's becoming ἔλεως, the Jewish people had not had possession of the temple and had not been able to recover it. Thus this state of graciousness was preceded by a state of wrath on the part of God, and regardless of how ἔλεως is translated, the idea of propitiation is present.

What caused God to become ἔλεως is discussed in detail where ἔλεως again occurs in 7:37. This section deals with vicarious or representative suffering, though it is well to notice that in one instance, 6:27-28, the suffering of Eleazar appears to set an example for others to follow.<sup>2</sup> In the case of the other martyrs, they twice state that their sufferings are for their own sins (7:18,32) and that the punishment they are receiving is just; at the same time, they think of themselves as representing the whole nation and securing for it the favor of God (7:37-38).<sup>3</sup> These two important verses

---

<sup>1</sup>The translation is that of the English Revised Version, which in the margin gives this note regarding the word gracious: "1 Gr. propitious."

<sup>2</sup>II Macc. 6:27-28, English Revised Version: "Wherefore, by manfully parting with my life now, I will shew myself worthy of mine old age, and leave behind a noble ensample to the young to die willingly and nobly a glorious death for the reverend and holy laws. And when he had said these words he went straightway to the instrument of torture."

<sup>3</sup>This is one of the clearest examples of vicarious sufferings and their value yet seen. Yet the fact that the sons were anything but silent as a lamb as they met death, that the

read:

I, like my brothers, give up body and soul for our father's laws, calling on God to show favour ( *ἔλεως* ) to our nation soon, and to make thee acknowledge, in torment and plagues, that he alone is God, and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and in my brothers.<sup>1</sup>

The whole incident centers around the death of these martyrs and their desire that by their sufferings and death, God may no longer manifest his anger but be *ἔλεως*. Men are the subject of the action; God is the object; the thing desired is for God to be propitiated, and the means to that end is their suffering and death.

In II Maccabees 10, Judas Maccabaeus and his men are threatened by Timotheus and a large army (10:24). The next two verses (10:25-26) state:

But as he (Timotheus) drew near, Maccabaeus and his men sprinkled earth upon their hands and girded their loins with sackcloth, in supplication to God, and falling down upon the step in front of the altar, besought him to become gracious to them ( *ἔλεως αὐτοῖς γενόμενον* ) and be an enemy to their adversaries, as the law declareth.<sup>2</sup>

There is no clear statement that God is angry with Judas and his men, but the text is clear that Judas fears that unless God is propitious and gracious, the only alternative is defeat in battle. The story records that Judas and his men

---

men admitted they too were sinners, and that the beneficiary of their suffering and death was only the Jewish nation all constitute great differences with their action and that of Christ.

<sup>1</sup>Text in GAP. Instead of "show favour," the English Revised Version reads "become gracious," and in the margin notes: "Gr. propitious."

<sup>2</sup>English Revised Version. Again in the margin where the text reads "gracious" is: "Gr. propitious."



were victorious, and gives major credit to the fact that God was propitious in stating, v. 28: "... one had a pledge of success and victory, not only in their valour but in their appeal to the Lord."<sup>1</sup>

IV Maccabees, which is very important for this study, was probably written between 20 and 54 A.D.<sup>2</sup> The author was

---

<sup>1</sup>Text in CAP. 10:29-30 describe in some detail the nature of the divine intervention that gave victory to the Jews.

<sup>2</sup>Hughes, The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature, p. 11: "All that can be said with certainty as to the date is that it was written somewhere about the commencement of the Christian era, after II Macc., and before A.D. 70." However, on p. 20 he dates it A.D. 1-10.

In fixing the time more exactly, there is no agreement among scholars such as Bissell, op. cit., p. 638 (about the middle of the first century B.C.); R. B. Townshend, "The Fourth Book of Maccabees," pp. 653-685 in CAP, II, 654 (between 63 B.C. and A.D. 38); W. R. Churton, The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures being the additions to the Old Testament Canon which were included in the ancient Greek and Latin versions, the English text of the Authorized Version Together with the additional matter found in the Vulgate and other ancient versions, Introductions to the Several Books and Fragments, Marginal Notes and References, and a General Introduction to the Apocrypha (London: J. Whitaker, 1884), pp. 564-565, ("shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem"); Grimm, Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer, p. 293 (after the fall of the Maccabees in the century before Christ and the reign of Caligula A.D. 37-41), and A. Deissmann, "Das vierte Makkabäerbuch," pp. 149-177, in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, Zweiter Band, übersetzt und herausgegeben von E. Kautzsch, 2 vols. (Tübingen, Frieberg, 1.B. und Leipzig: J. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900), p. 150 (between Pompey (B.C. 106-48) and Vespasian (A.D. 69-79)).

Moses Hadas (editor and translator), The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), presents a strong case for the beginning of the reign of Caligula, i.e., about 37 A.D. On pp. 95-96 he presents several linguistic arguments to bring the terminus post quem down to Augustus, and states: "But the clincher is the title assigned to Apollonius in 4:9: 'governor of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia.' It is natural for a writer to use titles appropriate in his own day, as can be shown by many examples; and, as Professor Bickermann has demonstrated, there was only a single short period in the early Roman Empire when Cilicia was associated with Syria for administrative purposes, and that was the period of 20-54 CE."

an orthodox Jew<sup>1</sup> of the diaspora,<sup>2</sup> well acquainted with Greek philosophy, especially with Stoic and Platonic thought.<sup>3</sup>

However, what he learned from Greek thinkers he put to the service of Judaism--not the other way.<sup>4</sup> All this is important since Paul lived at this time, was a Pharisee of the diaspora, and a Hebrew of the Hebrews.

Hadas is probably right in assuming that there is no literary dependence of IV Maccabees on the New Testament or vice versa,<sup>5</sup> but rather "Not only the striking parallel of vicarious expiation, but other similarities are due to the fact that these works derive from a common religious (and linguistic) climate."<sup>6</sup> Hadas is also correct in considering the emphasis in IV Maccabees on vicarious atonement as being

<sup>1</sup>Townshend, op. cit., p. 653: "At all events the author of this work, be it lecture or sermon, is unquestionably an orthodox Jew, and his object is to fire the hearts of his co-religionists . . ."

Hughes, The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature, p. 11, terms the author both a Hellenist and a Pharisaic Quietist.

<sup>2</sup>The author did not live in Jerusalem. Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, pp. 109-113, feels he lived in Antioch, though most scholars (see Townshend, op. cit., p. 657) feel he lived in Alexandria. In any event he was among the diaspora.

<sup>3</sup>Hughes, The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature, pp. 190-198; Townshend, op. cit., pp. 662-664; Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, pp. 115-118.

<sup>4</sup>Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, p. 121.

In like manner, Townshend, op. cit., p. 664, writes: "On the ethical question the author of Fourth Maccabees relies absolutely on the Mosaic Law. . . . He is a Jew to the core, and his conclusion is preemptory; for him the Law is the last word."

<sup>5</sup>Townshend, op. cit., p. 663, is in agreement with this position and discounts the position of I. Abrahams in the Jewish Encyclopaedia that IV Maccabees contains Christian interpolations at some points.

<sup>6</sup>Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, p. 122.



more in harmony with Christianity than rabbinic Judaism.<sup>1</sup>  
 Yet Hadas admits that in the intertestamentary period, such teaching was in the air, especially in the Apocalyptic group and that the idea of vicarious atonement "is a perfectly natural one for our author to have and express."<sup>2</sup>

In IV Macc. 6:27-29 ἑλὼς appears in the prayer of Eleazar:

Thou, O God, knowest that though I might save myself I am dying by fiery torments for thy Law. Be merciful (Gk.: ἑλὼς γενοῦ) unto thy people, and let our punishment be a satisfaction in their behalf (ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν). Make my blood their purification, and take my soul to ransom their souls.<sup>3</sup>

There is no doubt that in such a situation Eleazar feels that the people are under the wrath of God; his prayer is that because of his suffering, God will be propitious to the people. It will also be noted that the idea of vicarious atonement is much stronger here than in II Macc. 6:18-31, where the death of Eleazar is recorded. While ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν<sup>4</sup> can be rendered "in their behalf," ὑπέρ with the genitive can also have the usage "instead of"<sup>5</sup> or "in the place of."<sup>6</sup> Moreover, Moulton and Milligan, pointing out ὑπέρ can have the general usage of "for," "on behalf of," "in the place of,"

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 121-122.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 122.

<sup>3</sup>Text in CAP.

<sup>4</sup>Rahlfs' text and most MSS read ὑπέρ. Codex A reads περὶ.

<sup>5</sup>LSGL, p. 1857.

<sup>6</sup>Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Being: Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, translated, revised, and enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer), corrected edition (New York: American Book Company, 1889) (hereafter abbreviated TLNT), p. 639.



with the genitive, add: "From this it is easy transition to *ἐπὶ* in a substitutionary sense, . . ."<sup>1</sup>

While the idea of substitution is not new in the Jewish religion,<sup>2</sup> IV Maccabees, as Grimm rightly observes, carries the idea far beyond II Maccabees.<sup>3</sup> Grimm is again right in observing that this development not only took place through Old Testament passages, such as Is. 53:4 f., 8, 10 ff.; 57:1; and Dan. 11:35, but from incongruous circumstances, as when the best and not the worst people suffer.<sup>4</sup> As Deissmann observes, the doctrine of vicarious suffering is not a result of dogmatic teaching but is a bold religious interpretation of the events of life.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 651.

<sup>2</sup>See Townshend, op. cit., pp. 663-664, especially p. 663: "Indeed the whole Jewish theory of national religion was based on redemption by substitution."

The critique of Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, pp. 121-122, of this point fails to consider the suffering servant of Isaiah.

<sup>3</sup>Grimm, Das Zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Makkabäer, p. 327, referring to II Maccabees: "Ihre Martyrien bezwecken sonach zwar die Versöhnung Gottes, aber sie haben nicht, wie nach vorliegender Stelle u. 17, 20 die Bedeutung stellvertretender Sühnopfer."

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. "Diese Umbildung war nicht nur durch die alttestamentl. Stellen Jes. 53,4f. 8.10ff. Dan. 11,35. col. Jes. 57,1., sondern auch durch den Umstand sehr nahe gelegt, dass die Vorstellung von diesen Martyrien als Strafexemplen in so fern völlig haltlos war, als jene Märtyrer zu den treuesten Beobachtern des mosiaschen Gesetzes gehörten, menschliche Strafgerechtigkeit aber unter einer Masse, die sich gegen ein Gesetz vergangen haben, nicht die besseren, sondern die schlimmsten Uebertreter herausgreift."

<sup>5</sup>Deissmann, "Das vierte Makkabäerbuch," p. 160: "Diese Stelle ist wie 1,11. 17,21 wichtig für das Gerechte; man sieht auch hier, dass der ganze Gedanke nicht als ein starrer dogmatischer Lehrsatz entstanden, sondern entscheidend bestimmt ist durch die geheimnisvolle und kühne Intuition des religiösen Pathos."

The second instance of *ἐλεως* in IV Maccabees appears in the speech of the king to the men in 8:14: "You had better feel fear, my lads, and the Justice you worship will pardon (*ἐλεως ὑμῶν ἔσται*) your unwilling transgression."<sup>1</sup> The thought is that, because they were forced to sin, God will be propitious, forgiving, and gracious. *ἐλεως* has the same usage here as in II Maccabees.

The third instance is in IV Macc. 9:24:

War a holy and honourable warfare on behalf of righteousness, through which may (Gk.: *διὰ τῆς*) the just Providence that watched over our fathers become merciful (Gk.: *ἐλεως*<sub>2</sub>) unto his people and take vengeance on the accursed tyrant.

Two things are observable: first, *ἐλεως* represents a gracious, merciful, propitious attitude from God or Providence, which is desired but is not being enjoyed. However, the word is translated, it must include in its usage a change in the attitude of God toward the Jews. Second, the youth is telling his brothers that the means or instrument<sup>3</sup> by which God may become merciful to the people is their holy warfare, i.e., steadfast endurance of suffering; he feels that their

<sup>1</sup>Text in GAP.

<sup>2</sup>Text in GAP. In like manner, Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, p. 197, reads for the latter part of the verse: "Through it may the just Providence which watched over our fathers also become merciful to our people, and exact punishment from the accursed tyrant."

<sup>3</sup>TLNT, p. 133, discussing *διὰ* with the genitive, lists as the third major type of usage: "III. of the Means or Instrument by which anything is effected; because what is done by means of a person or thing seems to pass as it were through the same."

LSGL, p. 389, also discuss the "causal" usage of *διὰ* with the genitive.

See further Albrecht Oepke, TWNT, II, 64-69.

suffering may be the means of propitiating God in regard to all the Jews.

The last instance of *ἐλεως* in IV Maccabees is in 12:18. After having given the prayer of Eleazar in which he prays that his death may be a satisfaction in behalf of the people and that God will now be merciful to the people (6:27-29), and having recorded the encouragement of the oldest brother to engage in a holy warfare so that God may become merciful unto his people (9:24), the author now gives (12:18) the similar prayer or speech, and with a similar usage of *ἐλεως*, of the youngest brother just before he dies: "And I call upon the God of my fathers to be merciful (Gk.: *ἐλεως γένηται*) unto my nation."<sup>1</sup>

In eight of the nine instances of *ἐλεως*, it has the usage of "merciful," "gracious," or "propitious," and while in II Maccabees, the suffering of the martyrs is viewed as a propitiation on behalf of the people, in IV Maccabees this thought is intensified and the idea of substitution is met. In most instances of the use of the word, the graciousness of God which is sought is in contrast to the wrath which is so painfully evident. In these instances where the word has the usage of "propitious," the men, the martyrs, are the actors, God is the object, and propitiation is the purpose of their suffering.

---

<sup>1</sup>Text in CAP, following Codex A.

Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, gives a slightly different translation: "I call upon the God of my fathers to prove merciful to our nation."



# 7. ἑλαστήριος and ἑλαστήριον

ἑλαστήριος and ἑλαστήριον appear as variant readings in a very important passage in IV Macc. 17:22.<sup>1</sup> The adjective, ἑλαστήριος, is indicated in the reading of Codex A: τοῦ ἑλαστηρίου θανάτου αὐτῶν.<sup>2</sup> The view that this is the best reading is strongly supported by Morison,<sup>3</sup> and the reading is also followed by Thayer<sup>4</sup> and Liddell and Scott.<sup>5</sup> Morris<sup>6</sup> prefers the use of the term as an adjective

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of the importance of the work because of the background of the work, see pp. 115-117.

Moreover, Morris, in "The Meaning of ἑλαστήριον," p. 40, states: "It may not be without interest in this connexion that a modern Jewish writer like J. Klausner does not recognize a reference to the מַרְצֵיָהּ in Paul's use of ἑλαστήριον, but feels rather that it is to be explained along the lines of the 'propitiatory death' of the martyrs of IV Macc. xvii. 22, his words being 'Paul made use of the word ἑλαστήριον of IV Macc. xvii. 22 in the very same sense (Rom. iii.25), while in the LXX this word is the translation of מַרְצֵיָהּ ('mercy-seat' or 'ark-cover').'"

<sup>2</sup>Henry Barclay Swete (editor), The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint (Cambridge: The University Press, 1912), III, 760, prints the text of Codex A.

Since Townshend, op. cit., p. 654, states that Codices A, S, and V are the only uncial manuscripts containing IV. Maccabees, and since Swete indicates only Codex S has the article preceding θανάτου, it is assumed that Codex V follows the reading of A. However, Codex V is not nearly so important as Codex A or S. Rahlfs' edition does not even consider the readings of Codex Venetus (see f.n. at beginning of the text of IV Maccabees), which is considered an eighth century manuscript.

<sup>3</sup>James Morison, op. cit., pp. 298-299.

<sup>4</sup>TLNT, p. 301.

<sup>5</sup>LSGL, p. 828.

<sup>6</sup>Morris, "The Use of ἐλάσκεσθαι," p. 229, speaking of ἑλαστήριον writes: "The term also occurs in 4 Macc. 17.22, though here it may be held to derive from an adjective rather than a substantive."

And Morris, in "The Meaning of ἑλαστήριον," p. 42, gives the text of Cod. A first with the reading of Cod. S given secondarily within parentheses.

also, while Deissmann,<sup>1</sup> Büchsel,<sup>2</sup> and Sanday and Headlam<sup>3</sup> urge that this instance supports ἔλασθήριος as much as it does ἔλασθήριον.

On the other hand, the noun ἔλασθήριον is used in Codex S: τοῦ ἔλασθηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν. Rahlfs' eclectic text follows Codex S at this point without even giving the alternative reading of Codex A in the textual notes.<sup>4</sup> Moses Hadas in both his text<sup>5</sup> and translation<sup>6</sup> follows Codex S, while Townshend in his translation also clearly follows Codex S.<sup>7</sup>

It is a safe conclusion that neither Codex A nor Codex S is to be disregarded. The fact is that Codex S (4th century)<sup>8</sup> used the noun ἔλασθήριον to designate the nature of the death of these martyrs, while Codex A (5th century)<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann, "ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟC und ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 194: "Cod. S liest hier zwar τοῦ ἔλασθηρίου τοῦ θανάτου aber selbst wenn diese Lesart mit dem Substantiv ursprünglich wäre, was unwahrscheinlich ist, würden eben die anderen Handschriften den Beleg für das Adjektiv bieten."

<sup>2</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 320. After giving 4 Macc. 17:22 as an example of the adjective ἔλασθήριος, Büchsel adds in a footnote: "Die LA διὰ τοῦ ἔλασθηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν ist nicht vorzuziehen." But Büchsel does not dismiss the reading of Cod. S, and on p. 323, lines 10-13, when he quotes IV. Macc. 17:21 f., he follows the reading τοῦ ἔλασθηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν.

<sup>3</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 88.

<sup>4</sup>Rahlfs' edition of the LXX, op. cit., in loc.

<sup>5</sup>Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, p. 236.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 237, reads: "The expiation of their death."

<sup>7</sup>Townshend, op. cit., p. 683: "The propitiation of their death."

Also E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, translated by John Marsh (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1955), p. 291, f.n. 466.

<sup>8</sup>Rahlfs' edition of the LXX, op. cit., I, xlvi.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.



used the adjective *ἐλαστήριος* to indicate the nature of their death. Since the adjective admittedly has a general usage<sup>1</sup> and since *ἐλαστήριον* could apparently be used interchangeably with the adjective in this instance, the conclusion is strengthened that *ἐλαστήριον* is not a synonym for *תְּרִיבָה*,<sup>2</sup> and that it has a general instrumental usage regarding propitiation.

It may still be asked whether *ἐλαστήριον* in this instance has the usage of "expiation" or "propitiation" in verse 22: "It was through the blood of these righteous ones, and through the *ἐλαστήριον* of their death, that divine Providence preserved Israel, which had been ill used."<sup>3</sup> If the thought is primarily that the sufferers were a ransom (*ἀντίρρυχον*) for the sin of the nation (v. 21), then the idea of their expiating guilt may be the proper way to take the term. But if the thought is primarily that their death propitiated God and caused a change in the attitude of the divine Providence towards Israel so that the Jews were delivered (v. 22), it would seem best to translate the Greek as "propitiation." While in vv. 20-21 it is stated "through them . . . our country was purified," this can be taken to

---

<sup>1</sup>LSGL, p. 828, gives "propitiatory," "offered in propitiation."

<sup>2</sup>See discussion of Old Testament passages, pp. 71-74.

<sup>3</sup>This is the translation of Hadas, The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, in loc., except that instead of the Greek, he uses "expiation." Townshend, op. cit., in loc., translates the verse in a similar way though he uses "propitiation" for the Greek.



mean that their death was the means of purifying the country, or perhaps was the means that prevailed upon God to purify the country. The result of their action is indicated in 18:4: "And through them the nation obtained peace . . ." The idea is evidently present that by their death, sins were expiated and God was propitiated, and that God being both holy and moral, the two results are inseparable. There is no thought that the sufferings of the martyrs quantitatively expiated the sins of the country, while the thought is explicit that because of their heroic deaths God delivered the ill-treated Jews and the nation had peace. Propitiation, perhaps more accurately than expiation, expresses the ultimate consequence and purpose of their action, to cause God to become gracious towards the Jews.

After commenting on Paul, Büchsel states that also in IV Maccabees 17, it is God who creates the means of expiation and so delivers.<sup>1</sup> It is regretted that Büchsel does not cite the verse in chapter 17 which indicates this, for indeed one of the key differences to the usage of the word in IV Maccabees and in Romans is that in IV Maccabees it is never said that God has set forth or predetermined that these martyrs are to be the means of propitiation for the people. The tone of the book is that these martyrs propitiated God by their steadfastness, not that he, from his unmerited graciousness,

---

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 323, lines 12-13: "Auch 4 Makk 17 ist es Gott, der das Sühnmittel schafft und so errettet; . . ." Also Stauffer, op. cit., p. 291, f.n. 466.

provided the martyrs to effect reconciliation. In 13:13 and in 16:18 the people are reminded that the soul and existence are a gift of God, but they are also encouraged to sacrifice and endure for God. In 11:3 the fifth son states that "of myself I come forward." Aaron's act of propitiation with the censor is favorably referred to in 7:11, and Phinehas' act of propitiation is praised in 18:12. In 17:17-20 the martyrs are said now to stand beside the throne of God and to have received the honor that through them, the enemy had no more power over the nation. Yet this is predicated upon their steadfast suffering; it is not stated that God sent them, gave them, or caused them to make propitiation.

ἱλαστήριον appears as a noun in Codex S with the usage of "propitiation," and ἱλαστήριος appears as an adjective in Codex A with the usage "propitiatory." The noun and adjective have similar general usages, and neither refers to תְּכֵפֶת nor to any aspect of the Levitical ritual, nor to any article of the priestly equipment. ἱλαστήριον, and also the adjective, describe the purpose of the vicarious<sup>1</sup> suffering and death of these martyrs. They, by their steadfastness, availed in their plea to God to be merciful to the nation (6:27-29), so that God no longer manifested his wrath to the ill-treated Jews, but delivered them.

---

<sup>1</sup>See discussion of the instances of ἕλεως in IV Maccabees.

## D. Conclusions

Certain works in this body of literature are much nearer to the Christian viewpoint regarding atonement and God's grace than they are to Rabbinic thought. Some ideas are present in this Jewish literature that may have had their roots in Greek soil, but had already been adapted to a strain of Judaism prior to the writings of either Paul or John.

Sometimes words of the *ἑλάσκεσθαι* group have the usage of "forgive" or "forgiveness," usually referring to God as forgiving or to God's forgiveness, but in most of these instances the contrasting thought is destruction, which could be interpreted as a manifestation of God's wrath. In several cases, the idea of propitiation, even of man's propitiating God by alms, works, sacrifices, prayers, or suffering, is plainly indicated.

In regard to *ἑλασμός* and *ἑλαστήριον*, the members of the *ἑλάσκεσθαι* group used by Paul and John, each appears only once. Yet the one instance of *ἑλασμός*, II Macc. 3:33, does much to give definiteness to the very general usage of the word in the Greek Old Testament, for it undoubtedly has the usage of "propitiation." Yet on the other hand, the variety of usages in the Old Testament prevents the ascription of too definite a usage, such as "sacrifice of propitiation," to the word.

*ἑλαστήριον*, as in the Old Testament, is an instrument or means whereby man is enabled to experience the grace rather than the wrath of God.<sup>1</sup> The instance in IV Macc.

---

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 77-78.



17:22 reinforces the Old Testament teaching about vicarious atonement. Moreover it strengthens the view that *ἑλαστήριον* is not synonymous with *תְּנִיחָה* nor does it designate the place of propitiation. Clearly in IV Maccabees, not a place, but the death of the martyrs, is the instrument of propitiation. The fact that in Codex A *ἑλαστήριος* appears rather than *ἑλαστήριον* indicates that the noun and adjective perhaps had a similar usage, and that a rather general usage: "propitiation" or "propitiatory," "instrument of propitiation," or "tending to propitiate," existed. The one great point of difference in the usage of *ἑλαστήριον* in IV Maccabees and in the Old Testament in general is that the *ἑλαστήριον* here is wrought by the death of the martyrs and their steadfastness to the law in the face of suffering and that the initiative of God, if to be found at all, is much more obscure than in the canonical literature. The idea that man may propitiate God is present in the Old Testament, e.g., the story of Phinehas, but it is a minor theme, while in IV Maccabees it is a major theme.

### Chapter III

#### THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

##### A. Introduction

This body of literature merits special consideration not only because the Scrolls were first discovered in 1947,<sup>1</sup> but because of the instances that  $\aleph \beth \daleth$  appears in this material<sup>2</sup> and the general light the works throw on the background of the New Testament.

There is no agreement among scholars as to the exact date of composition of the Scrolls;<sup>3</sup> however, radiocarbon tests on the linen with which the Scrolls were wrapped date the linen at 33 A.D. plus or minus 200 years.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, other investigations date the Scrolls between 300 B.C. and 68 or 70 A.D.<sup>5</sup> "The Manual of Discipline cannot be dated much later

---

<sup>1</sup>Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The Viking Press, 1956), p. 3 ff., relates the circumstances of the discovery.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendices V, VI, and VII for a tabulation of those instances of  $\aleph \beth \daleth$  that will be considered in this study.

<sup>3</sup>See W. F. Albright, "Postscript - The Chronology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," pp. 57-60 in Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12, The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, Translation and Notes, by William Hugh Brownlee (New Haven, Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 59, and literature cited in f.n. 10.

Burrows, op. cit., p. 52.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 101: "All the lines of investigation converge fairly well on a historical period within which all the manuscripts were written, extending from about 300 B.C. to 68 or 70 A.D."

than 100 B.C."<sup>1</sup> The Damascus Document or "Fragments of a Zadokite Work,"<sup>2</sup> which is closely related to the Dead Sea Scrolls,<sup>3</sup> was also written in this period of 300 B.C. - 70 A.D.<sup>4</sup>

When considering the Damascus Document, Charles noted the similar perspectives of the Damascus Document and Christianity<sup>5</sup> and observed, "It is not at all improbable that some, if not many, of them joined the Christian Church." The community that produced the Dead Sea Scrolls, whether Zadokites,<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 118.

<sup>2</sup>So entitled by R. H. Charles in "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," pp. 785-834 in CAP, Vol. II.

S. Schechter also uses this title in Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Volume I, Fragments of a Zadokite Work, edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection now in the possession of the University Library, Cambridge, and provided with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes (Cambridge: The University Press, 1910).

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, op. cit., p. 187 ff.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 194: "The Damascus Document is evidently a product of the same general period as the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is probably later than the earliest scrolls, but may very well be earlier than the latest ones."

Ibid., pp. 213-214. Here Burrows gives Rabinowitz's dating which dates the Manual of Discipline 175-167 B.C., the earliest stratum of the Damascus Document 167-165 B.C., and the second and third strata of the Damascus Document at 157-152 B.C.

Charles, in "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," CAP, II, 788, dated the work probably "between 18 B.C. and A.D. 70, or possibly between 18 B.C. and 8 B.C."

And Burrows, op. cit., p. 201, gives the view of Dupont-Sommer that the work was written a little before 40 B.C., yet Burrows' own view is that: "One is reluctantly driven to agree with Chaim Rabin, the latest editor of the Damascus Document, that it is still 'much too early to come to any conclusions' concerning the date of the composition of its component parts."

<sup>5</sup>Charles, CAP, II, 794.

<sup>6</sup>Burrows, op. cit., pp. 275-277.



a group of Pharisees,<sup>1</sup> Essenes,<sup>2</sup> Ebionites,<sup>3</sup> some amalgam of these groups, or yet a different group, had striking similarities to that of early Christianity, as well as marked differences from it.<sup>4</sup>

The method of studying the teaching of the Qumran community regarding propitiation and atonement will be to consider the instances of  $\overline{\text{רצח}}$  as members of this family of words appear in the discoveries in Qumran Cave I, the Manual of Discipline, and the Damascus Document. Surely it would be grand if early Greek translations of these documents were also available as a close relationship between  $\overline{\text{רצח}}$  words and  $\overline{\text{ἰλάσκεσθαι}}$  words has already been established, and in Sirach it was observed that every known instance of a

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 278.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 279-298. On p. 298 Burrows concludes his study of this subject: "In many ways it was akin to the Essenes, as we know them from sources of the Roman period. If this term is used in a broad, comprehensive sense, we may legitimately call the Qumran sectarians Essenes. For the present, however, in order not to prejudge the case, it seems better to reserve that name for the group described by Philo and Josephus, which, if their reports are accurate, was not exactly identical or coextensive with the Qumran community. As a matter of convenience we may still designate the latter by the term 'covenanters,' which implies neither the acceptance nor the rejection of their identification with the Essenes. At any rate, it is clear that the sect of Qumran was more closely related to the Essenes than to any other group known to us."

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 295-297.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 326-345. Burrows notes: "There are many points of similarity in the life and ideals of the Qumran sect and those of the early church of Jerusalem." And again: "Some of the most characteristic theological doctrines of the New Testament have parallels in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Yet he observes: "Even the scholars who have looked most eagerly for parallels between the early Christians and the covenanters have recognized that there are equally notable differences."

כפך word was rendered into the Greek with some form of ἱλάσκεσθαι or a cognate. The mere frequency of כפך words does much to substantiate the statement that "The doctrine and practice of expiation played a great part in the theology and liturgy of the sectaries of Qumran."<sup>1</sup>

## B. Material Considered

### 1. Qumran Cave I

Forms of כפך appear 10 times in Barthelemy and Milik's publication of this material, though six of these instances have all or part of the word in brackets, indicating an original text that was not very clear.<sup>2</sup>

In four instances, the text is so fragmentary that beyond furnishing information that כפך did appear and the subject of atonement was being discussed, little information is afforded. In 22-24-1 the text is so fragmentary that no translation is even offered by the editors, and indeed three of the four letters are placed in brackets in any event.<sup>3</sup> In 25-4-4 the term כפר appears<sup>4</sup> and is rendered, "and

<sup>1</sup>D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, Jordan Department of Antiquities, Ecole Biblique et Archeologique Francaise, Palestine Archaeological Museum: Discoveries in the Judean Desert - I: Qumran Cave I, With contributions by R. De Vaux, H. J. Plenderleith, G. M. Crowfoot, and G. L. Harding (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 153: "... La doctrine et la pratique de l'expiation jouaient un grand role dans la theologie et dans la liturgie des sectaires de Qumran: cf. 1QS ii 8 kkk 6, 8 v 6 viii 6, 10 ix 4 xi 14, 1QSa i e, CD iii 4, 11, 18 iv 6/7, 9/10 xiv 19 xx 34, 1QH, Meg. Gen. 11, pl. ix 33, 1Q22 iii 11 iv 3 24 1, 1Q25 4 4, 1Q27 6 2, 3, 1ci, f. 3 i 5."

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix VII for a full listing of every instance, an indication of words and parts of words bracketed, and the translation of the word in 9 instances.

<sup>3</sup>Barthelemy and Milik, op. cit., p. 96.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 101. In a footnote uncertainty is indicated and כפר is suggested as a possible alternative.

their ransom." However, since the nature, need, source, recipient, purpose, or result of the ransom is not indicated in the fragment, it does little to advance the study. In 27-6-2 and 3 is the passage: "... then ... he will pardon (כפר) errors ... forevermore before before his face in order to pardon (לכפר) ..."<sup>1</sup> The instance at 27-6-2 may mean God will graciously forgive, but that is not certain. The instance at 27-6-3 is interesting and raises questions as to who offers what before whose face in order that who may pardon whom for what, but it does not answer them.

In two instances the usage of כפר may be termed non-cultic. In 34-3-1-5 is the phrase: "And you have made of the impious our ransom (כפרנו) ..."<sup>2</sup> The phrase is short, but the usage seems similar to the idea in Prov. 21:18 and Is. 43:3,<sup>3</sup> where כפר is related to the idea of substitution.

In Sa-1-3 is the statement: "They ('They' apparently refers to the members of the Qumran community) are the men of His design, those who have kept His covenant in the midst of impiety in order to make expiation (לכפר) for the country."<sup>4</sup> While "propitiation" or "atonement" might be used instead of "expiation" to render the verb, regardless of the word used, the idea of vicarious atonement is present. The

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 106.

<sup>2</sup>Barthelemy and Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

<sup>3</sup>See pp. 39-40 and Appendix II, A.

<sup>4</sup>Barthelemy and Milik, *op. cit.*, p. 109. The French reads: "Ce sont eux les 'hommes de Son dessein', ceux qui ont gardé Son alliance au sein de l'impiété afin de faire l'expiation pour le pays." *faire?*



obedience of the community will serve to make atonement for the entire country.

In four instances כפר appears with a cultic usage. At 34-2-5 כפר appears in a fragment which has the title and opening phrase of a prayer to be given on the day of expiation: "Prayer for the Day of Expiation (כפורים) Remember Oh Lord . . ." <sup>1</sup> While this instance does not shed any new light on the usage of כפר, it does indicate a concern of the community for the Day of Atonement and the ritual to be followed on that occasion.

In 22-iii-7-11, כפר appears twice:

[that the Lord] [will bless you in pardoning your] (לכפר לכם) faults . . . that <sup>8</sup> . . . in the year . . . of the month <sup>9</sup> . . . on this day . . . [because] your fathers <sup>10</sup> were wanderers [in the desert] up to the tenth day of [the seventh month . . .] the tenth day of the month <sup>11</sup> you will abstain from all work and on the tenth day of the month the expiation will be celebrated (יכפר) . . . of the month. <sup>2</sup>

Here again the passage refers to the Day of Atonement. And while in line 11, the Hebrew could also be rendered "the propitiation will be performed" or "the atonement will be made," the thought in line 7 has emphasis upon God's initiative and graciousness. It is God who blesses, and it is God who pardons. It is regrettable that the Hebrew text of line 7 is not clearer. <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 153. And this notation is also given: "Le Jour de l'Expiation": mentionné aussi en 1QpHab xi 7. Cette fête rappelle une date importante pour l'histoire de la Secte; cf. S. Talmon, 'Yom Hakkippurim in the Habakkuk Scroll,' *Biblica*, xxxii, 1951, pp. 549-63. . . ."

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 94. The French translation renders the two Hebrew terms: "en vous pardonnant" and "l'expiation sera célébrée."

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. The Hebrew of line 7 reads:  
[הזאת יברככם מלך] [לכפר לכם] את עוונותיכם  
[אתך את הזאת]

The last instance of כפר in this body of material is in 22-iv-3. Lines 2-3 read:

2[And] he [will take] of [his blood and he] will spread it on the soil . . . and it will be spread . . . 3. . . [and it will be par]doned ( ויכ[וּפֶר] ) to them by this means. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The fragment is not clear as to just what ritual is performed; moreover, a good part of the Hebrew text is not very clear. Yet the context indicates a gracious pardoning on the part of God, but only after a certain blood ritual has been performed.

This body of literature thus uses כפר still with the clear idea of substitution. The verb is used in a non-ritualistic way to indicate the atonement wrought by the obedience of a few for the entire country. And the verb is used in ritualistic contexts to indicate God's pardoning or forgiving action, but such action seems to be inseparably bound together with or predicated upon the faithful performance of a cultic act by the people or their representative.

## 2. The Manual of Discipline

The Manual of Discipline is a fruitful source of information regarding the Qumran community. A member of the group is to love those in the community but to hate those that God has rejected,<sup>2</sup> to be angry at those in error but to show mercy to those who repent.<sup>3</sup> In fact, the work contains a long prayer asking God to curse all the men of Belial's lot.<sup>4</sup> The

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 95.

<sup>2</sup>"The Manual of Discipline," following the translation in Burrows, *op. cit.* See p. 371, lines 3-4.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 386, line 25 ff.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 372, line 21 - p. 373, line 6. Compare Jer. 18:23.

study of the law is exalted,<sup>1</sup> and certain rituals help one who is obedient to be accepted before God.<sup>2</sup> The wrath, fury, and anger of God are assumed and accepted<sup>3</sup> as objective realities, both in this life and in the life to come.

However, salvation is considered as rooted in God and his righteousness. Indeed, in the final section of the Manual of Discipline, God's righteousness is considered as a justifying, saving righteousness.<sup>4</sup>

After citing a passage from the Thanksgiving Psalms to show that "Paul's utter distrust of all human righteousness is not unlike what appears in some of the scrolls,"<sup>5</sup> Millar Burrows quotes two passages from the Manual of Discipline, one of which contains 730, and he makes an important observation:<sup>6</sup>

The idea that only God is righteous, and no man can claim any righteousness in his sight, appears already in very similar language in the Old Testament. But the covenanters did not stop there.<sup>7</sup> Something approaching Paul's idea of

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 378, lines 25-34.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 373, line 38 - p. 374, line 4.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 372, line 38 - p. 373, line 6; p. 375, lines 21-27; p. 377, lines 16-21.

<sup>4</sup>See also Ps. 116:4.

See discussion of Schrenk in Gottfried Quell and Gottlob Schrenk, Righteousness, translated from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, with additional notes, by J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951), pp. 16-17, 29-31. See also Schrenk, TWNT, III, 187, lines 37-45.

<sup>5</sup>Burrows, op. cit., p. 334.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Schrenk, as cited in f.n. 4 above, believes the Old Testament went beyond this too. However, an expression as explicit as these passages in the Manual of Discipline is difficult to find in the Old Testament.



justification by the righteousness of God is expressed in the concluding psalm of the Manual of Discipline:

As for me, if I slip, the steadfast love of God is my  
salvation forever;  
and if I stumble in the iniquity of flesh,  
my vindication in the righteousness of God will stand  
to eternity.

\* \* \*

And in his steadfast love he will bring my vindication.  
In his faithful righteousness he has judged me,  
and in the abundance of his goodness he will forgive  
(כפר)<sup>1</sup> all my iniquities.

The point of prime importance here is that while man has no righteousness of his own, there is a righteousness which God, in his own righteousness, freely confers. The meaning of the righteousness of God in Romans 3:21-26 is thus illustrated and shown to be rooted in pre-Christian Judaism.

Brownlee gives a similar translation but one which even more clearly emphasizes God in his righteousness, justifying man. Brownlee's translation reads:<sup>2</sup>

And in His dependable mercy He will bring my justification.  
In His steadfast righteousness He has justified me  
And in His great goodness He will pardon (or, atone for)  
all my iniquities.

In a footnote Brownlee observes that such usage without a doubt "contributed to the Christian doctrine of divine initiative in atonement (Rom. 3:24 f.; 5:11; II Cor. 5:18 ff.;

---

<sup>1</sup>The text is from Millar Burrows, assisted by John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee (editors), The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Volume II, Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951), Plate XI, line 14.

<sup>2</sup>William Hugh Brownlee, Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12, The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, Translation and Notes (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951), p. 44.

I John 4:10)."<sup>1</sup>

The remaining nine instances of רפך can be roughly divided into two kinds of usages.

The first group consists of instances where the individual, especially those who refuse to enter God's covenant, shall not benefit by the action indicated by רפך.

The first instance is in Plate II, line 8, where the Levites are cursing the men of Belial's lot:

May God not favor thee when thou callest;  
And may He not be forgiving to pardon (רפך)   
thine iniquities;

The writer, as Jeremiah on occasion, seems to be afraid that God will be too forgiving,<sup>3</sup> though this passage does presume that the men of Belial may call on God, attempting to obtain favor. Yet "to pardon" is a better translation of רפך than "to be propitious," for the object is the people's iniquities.<sup>4</sup> However, as in Jeremiah, the alternative to having their iniquities forgiven or pardoned is the visitation of the wrath of God. This is brought out by what immediately follows in the cursing: "May he lift up his angry countenance

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 45, f.n. 29: "For the idiom 'atone' used of God's forgiveness, cf. II Chron. 30:18; Sir. 5:5f; GDC II, 5(2:3), III, 18 (5:5), IV, 10 (6:6); XX, 34 (9:54); XIV, 19 (18:9). However the idiom is to be interpreted with regard to God, it doubtless contributed to the Christian doctrine of divine initiative in atonement (Rom. 3:24f.; 5:11; II Cor. 5:18ff.; I Jn. 4:10)."

<sup>2</sup>Brownlee, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>See p. 23, where Jer. 18:23 is discussed.

<sup>4</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 372, gives the translation: "May God not be gracious to you when you call, and may he not pardon, forgiving your iniquities; . . ."

for vengeance upon you, . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Again, atonement rituals are said to be of no avail for the person who refuses to enter God's covenant (Plate III, line 4):

He will not be purified by atonement offerings (בכפורים) and he will not be made clean with the water for impurity; he will not sanctify himself with seas and rivers or be made clean with any water of washing.

Yet the community did not avoid all ritual, and rites, especially those involving water, were apparently used and considered aids in the cleansing of sin regarding those who were obedient. But Brownlee's translation emphasizes the fact that basically, it is not through either ritual or obedience, though they are both used and obedience is certainly viewed as necessary, but rather "it is through the spirit of God's true counsel" that a man's iniquities will be atoned. Plate III, lines 6-12, containing three instances of כפר read:

5. . . Unclean! Unclean! shall he be as long as he rejects  
 6 God's \*laws\* so as not to be instructed by the Community of  
 His counsel. For it is through the spirit of God's true  
 counsel (in regard to) a man's ways that all<sup>7</sup> his iniquities  
 \*will be atoned\* (יכופרו) so that he may look upon the  
 life-giving light, and through a holy spirit disposed toward  
 Unity in His truth that he will be cleansed of all<sup>8</sup> his ini-  
 quities, and through an upright and humble spirit that his  
 sin will be atoned (תכופר), and through the submission  
 of his soul to all God's ordinances<sup>9</sup> that his flesh \*will be  
 cleansed\* so that he may purify himself with water for impu-  
 rity and sanctify himself with rippling water; and he will  
 direct his steps so as to walk perfectly<sup>10</sup> in all God's ways,  
 as He commanded for His appointed seasons, not turning right

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 373.

Brownlee, *op. cit.*, p. 12, uses the reflexive or middle voice throughout and gives a simpler translation of כפר: "He cannot purify himself by atonement, . . ."



or left, nor <sup>11</sup>transgressing a single one of all his provisions. Then will he procure pardon before God through agreeable atonements ( כפר ); and this will become for him a covenant of <sup>13</sup>eternal Communion.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, "agreeable atonements" are a means of procuring pardon before God. But this does not mean a magical non-moral act of propitiation, for one must have "a holy spirit," a "humble spirit," and he must submit to God's ordinances. And this high teaching is yet made more theocentric when it is said that sins will be atoned "through the spirit of God's true counsel." Such "spirit" is not necessarily to be considered a forerunner of the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit, but it does raise the study of the Law above mere legalism, and it indicates that salvation is ultimately a gift from God.<sup>2</sup>

In Plate V, line 6, one of the functions of the leaders of the community is to:

5. . . . lay a foundation of truth for Israel for the community of <sup>6</sup>an eternal covenant, to atone ( לכפר ) for all who offer themselves for holiness in Aaron and for a house of truth in Israel, and those who joined with them for community and for controversy and for judgment, <sup>7</sup>to condemn all who transgress the statute.<sup>3</sup>

This sheds no new light on the idea of propitiation or on the

<sup>1</sup>Brownlee, op. cit., p. 12.

Burrows, op. cit., pp. 373-374, gives a slightly different translation.

The text for that portion of lines 6 and 7 where כפר first occurs, as given in Burrows, Trever, and Brownlee, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. II, Fascicle II, Plate III, lines 6-7, reads: כיא ברוח עצת אמת אל דרכי איש יכופרו כול עוונותו ---

<sup>2</sup>This view is stated even clearer in ibid., Vol. II, Fascicle II, Plate XI, lines 12-15. See discussion, pp. 135-137.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, op. cit., pp. 376-377.

usage of כפר, but indicates the leaders played a role similar to those of Moses and Aaron in early Hebrew history.

The second group of instances of כפר involve an atonement being made by the community for the land. Yet the community is not considered as ransoming the guilty or effecting a vicarious atonement for the wicked. Indeed in one of these three passages, it is indicated that at the same time atonement is made for the land, the wicked will be judged:

When these things come to pass in Israel, the council of the community will be established in the truth for an eternal planting, a holy house for Israel, a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron, true witnesses for justice and the elect by God's will, to make atonement (לכפר) for the land and to render to the wicked their recompense . . .<sup>1</sup>

And they ("they" apparently refers to the council of the community.) shall be accepted to make atonement (לכפר) for the land and to decide the judgment of wickedness, and there shall be no error.<sup>2</sup>

The third instance is primarily concerned to show that obedience to the law is more effective than sacrifice in effecting atonement or ransoming guilt:

When these things come to pass in Israel according to all these regulations, for a foundation of a holy spirit, for eternal truth, for a ransom (לכפר) for the guilt of transgression and sinful faithlessness, and for acceptance for the land more than the flesh of whole burnt offerings and the fate of sacrifice, . . .<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, Trever, and Brownlee, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. II, Fascicle 2, Plate VIII, lines 5 and 6, translation by Burrows, p. 381.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., Vol. II, Fascicle 2, Plate VIII, line 9<sup>1</sup>, translation by Burrows, p. 382.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, translating Plate IX, lines 3-4, as given in ibid., Vol. II, Fascicle 2, p. 383.

Brownlee, op. cit., p. 34. Brownlee renders לכפר "for making atonement" instead of "for ransom." He also uses the more personal term "divine favor" instead of "acceptance" to

In summation, this Manual of Discipline is concerned about sin and atoning for it. There is a place for rituals in effecting atonement within the community, but obedience to the law is a precondition for the effectiveness of ritual and more than a worthy substitute for sacrifices. God's wrath is real and shall fall on those who refuse to join the community. The community believes it is the instrument to make atonement for the land; it views a harsh end for the wicked. And it seems to desire punishment for the men of Belial's lot.

Of greatest importance is the passage in the concluding psalm that emphasizes God's initiative in salvation, and recognizes that God's righteousness is a saving righteousness.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. Damascus Document

This work sounds a strong and stern Jewish note in its teaching regarding the Sabbath:

Let not a man help an animal to give birth on the Sabbath day; and if she lets her young fall into a cistern or a ditch, let him not raise it on the Sabbath. . . . And if any person falls into a place of water, or into a place, let not a man come up by a ladder or rope or instrument.<sup>2</sup>

It mentions the wrath of God again and again.<sup>3</sup> Yet the

---

render  $\eta\iota\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\omega$ . Too, it is interesting that Brownlee's translation reads "the Holy Spirit" instead of "a holy spirit."

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 135-137 for discussion of this important passage.

<sup>2</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 360. Following the numbering system in R. H. Charles' "The Fragments of a Zadokite Work," pp. 785-834 in *CAP*, Vol. II, this passage is from 13:22-26. Compare Matt. 12:1-12 and parallels. See especially Mark 2:27.

<sup>3</sup>See 1:17; 3:7; 4:7; 7:17; 9:13, 26, 40; 11:4.



emphasis is upon the love and faithfulness of God, not on the merit of men. Moses is quoted with approval as saying:

Not because of your righteousness or the uprightness of your heart are you going in to possess these nations, but because of his love for your fathers, and because of his keeping the oath.<sup>1</sup>

This theocentric emphasis is seen also in the seven instances in which  $\text{רָצוּ}$  appears.<sup>2</sup> In every instance, either God or the Messiah is the subject.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, there is never any idea of man's appeasing God in these instances, though, as on other occasions, where God does not forgive, the offender is believed to be destined to suffer the wrath of God. With this alternative to God's forgiveness being borne in mind, nevertheless Burrows translates the six instances he considers with a form of "forgive," and Charles renders the text each time into English with either "forgive" or "pardon."<sup>4</sup>

The first instance, 2:3, is the assurance of God's willingness to pardon those who repent, while assuring those who continue to transgress that God will punish them in wrath: Longsuffering is with him, and abundance of pardon to forgive ( $\text{לִכְפֹּר}$ )<sup>5</sup> those who turn from transgression, but

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 356. The passage is from 9:23.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix VI for a listing of every instance of  $\text{רָצוּ}$ , the form of the verb used, and the translation given by Charles, Rabin, and Burrows.

<sup>3</sup>God is the subject in at least the first six instances. In the seventh instance, either God or the Messiah is viewed as the subject of the verb. However, the text is so uncertain that Burrows offers no translation of Chapter 18 past verse 6.

<sup>4</sup>At 6:60 "make atonement for" is used by Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," *GAP*, II, in *loc.*, to render  $\text{רָצוּ}$  but in "Addenda et Corrigenda to Volume II," *GAP*, II, xiii, Charles notes that "make atonement for" is to be replaced with "pardon." Rabin *op. cit.*, always renders  $\text{רָצוּ}$  with some form of "make conciliation" or "make reconciliation."

<sup>5</sup>Schechter, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

power and might and great wrath with flames of fire by all the angels of destruction upon those who turn aside from the way and abhor the statute so that they shall have no remnant or survival.<sup>1</sup>

The alternative to forgiveness is destruction, yet God is willing to forgive the repentant. There is no thought of the people's propitiating God. Rather, they must turn to receive the abundance of pardon that already rests with him.

In Chapter 5:5 is one of the clearest examples of God, extending unmerited forgiveness to sinners, that is to be found outside the New Testament. Chapter 5:4-5 read:

But they defiled themselves with the transgression of man, and in the ways of the unclean woman, and they said, "That is for us." But God in his wondrous mysteries forgave their iniquity and pardoned their transgression,<sup>2</sup> and he built for them a sure house in Israel, the like of which has not existed from of old or until now.<sup>3</sup>

Here God is presented as forgiving and pardoning, even in the face of their transgressions. The author seems aware of the uniqueness of his position in speaking of the forgiveness of God in the face of sin and that such pardoning is above human comparisons, so he prefaces the statement: "But God in his wondrous mysteries."<sup>4</sup>

The next three instances of כפר occur in Chapter 6:3-6:

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 350. The passage quoted is 2:3-5.

<sup>2</sup>The text for this important passage, as given by Rabin, *op. cit.*, p. 13, and which shows that כפר is used in conjunction with נש in this instance reads:

ואל ברזי פלאו כפר בעד עונם וישא לפשעם.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-352.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 351.

Rabin, *op. cit.*, p. 12, similarly translates: "But God in His wonderful mysteries made reconciliation for their trespass and pardoned their impiety, . . ."

Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," *CAP*, II, in *loc.*, notes the text reads פלאו ברזי for this phrase, but gives a similar translation: "But God wondrously pardoned their sins, . . ."

<sup>3</sup>Behold the explanation of their names according to their generations, and the period of their abiding, and the number of their distresses, and the years of their sojourning, and the explanation of their works,<sup>4</sup> the first saints whom God forgave (כפר), and who justified the righteous and condemned the wicked.

<sup>5</sup>All who come after them must do according to the explanation of the law in which the forefathers were instructed until the completion of the period of these years. <sup>6</sup>According to the covenant which God established with the forefathers to forgive (לכפר) their sins, so God will forgive (יכפר) them.<sup>1</sup>

The instance of כפר in verse 4 is interesting since not only is God the subject of the verb, but the first saints, who were good men, also needed and received pardoning by God. Hence, even good men are not forgiven ultimately because of their works but by an act of God. The two instances of כפר in verse 6 indicate that the purpose of God in establishing a covenant in ages past was to forgive the sins of the people, and it reassures the reader that God shall pardon them.

The sixth instance of כפר appears in 9:54, which appears only in manuscript B. 9:50-54 read:

<sup>50</sup>But all who hold fast to these ordinances, going out and coming in according to the law, and who listen to the voice of a teacher and confess before God, <sup>51</sup>"We have sinned, we have done wickedly, both we and our fathers, in walking contrary to the statutes of the covenant; right and true are thy judgments against us"; <sup>52</sup>all who do not lift a hand against his holy statutes and his righteous judgments and his true testimonies; <sup>53</sup>who are instructed in the former judgments with which the men of the community were judged; who give ear to the voice of a teacher of righteousness and do not reject the statutes of righteousness when they hear them--<sup>54</sup>they shall rejoice and be glad, and their hearts shall be strong and they shall prevail over all the sons of the world, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, op. cit., p. 352.



God will forgive them (וכפר אל בעדם), and they shall see his salvation (וראו בישועתו), because they have taken refuge in his holy name. (וכי אסו בשם קדשו).<sup>1</sup>

Those whom God will forgive are those that obey the law and confess their sins before God (9:50 ff.), yet it is God who will pardon (וכפר). It is not a case of the men's either earning salvation or propitiating the wrath of God. Indeed the passage closes on a note that gives hints of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. And this hint becomes even clearer if the translation of Charles is followed for 9:54b:

And God will pardon them  
And they shall see His salvation;  
For they trust in His holy name.<sup>2</sup>

The term יסו<sup>3</sup> is also rendered with "trust" by Schechter,<sup>4</sup> but is rendered with "for they have taken refuge" by Rabin.<sup>5</sup> Either translation conveys the idea that the people will be pardoned and will be saved because they have trusted in the refuge of God's name.

The last instance of כפר occurs in 18:9, where the text is so uncertain that it is not certain as to whether the subject of the verb is God or the Messiah which shall arise from Aaron and Israel. Burrows omits this section from his translation.<sup>6</sup> The translation of Charles, who believes the subject of the verb is God,<sup>7</sup> reads: "... (The Messiah from)

<sup>1</sup>Text used is that published by Schechter, *op. cit.*, p. 20: translation is that of Burrows, *op. cit.*, pp. 357-358.

<sup>2</sup>Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," *CAP*, II, 828.

<sup>3</sup>*BDB*, p. 340.

<sup>4</sup>Schechter, *op. cit.*, p. xlvi.

<sup>5</sup>Rabin, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

<sup>6</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*

<sup>7</sup>Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," *CAP*, II, 832. Charles comments: "And He will make atonement." Since in the

Aaron and Israel. And He will pardon our sins . . ."<sup>1</sup> The translation of Rabin indicates it is the Messiah who makes conciliation for the trespasses of the people.<sup>2</sup> If so, this would be an interesting change from the other instances of  $\text{רצו}$ , and would indicate a mediator "anointed," presumably by God, making atonement. Unfortunately, the text is not clear enough for much value to be derived from this instance.

The Damascus Document, as the Manual of Discipline, attaches great importance to obedience of the law. Yet God is the subject of the verb,  $\text{רצו}$ , which is to be rendered with "pardon" or "forgive" rather than "make propitiation." The purpose of God in establishing the covenant is to forgive the people, and at one point He is said to forgive even in the face of the sin of the people. There is the hint at one point, too, that while obedience to the law and confession of sin are expected of God's people, they are pardoned and saved because they trust in the refuge of His holy name.

#### 4. Other Works

In other works among the Dead Sea Scrolls, certain passages throw light upon the doctrine of the Qumran community regarding sin, salvation, and atonement.

In the Habakkuk Commentary, an interpretation is placed

---

other four passages where atonement is mentioned God is the agent, we conclude that it is so here. See v. 5 note."

<sup>1</sup>Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," CAP, II, 832.

<sup>2</sup>Rabin, *op. cit.*, p. 70. "they shall walk during the epoch of wickedness, until there shall arise the Messiah of Aaron and Israel, and he will make conciliation for their trespass . . ."

upon Habakkuk 2:4 quite different from that given by Paul.<sup>1</sup>  
 The comment upon the phrase, "But the righteous shall live by his faith," reads:

This means all the doers of the law in the house of Judah, whom God will rescue from the house of judgment because of their labor and their faith in the teacher of righteousness.<sup>2</sup>

Yet, while the Habakkuk Commentary feels that man is saved by faith and works, a passage in The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness indicates, as the Damascus Document 5:5, that salvation is from God, sometimes even in the face of the evil deeds of men. While the salvation being spoken of is not eschatological, it is still noteworthy in being ascribed to God in the face of the sins of the people:

Moreover by our kings thou didst save us many times, because of thy mercy and not according to our works, in which we acted wickedly, and the evil deeds of our transgressions. Thine is the battle, and from thee is power, and it is not ours; nor has our strength or the might of our hands done valiantly, but it is by thy strength . . .<sup>3</sup>

The idea of faith as being related to man's blessedness is again seen<sup>4</sup> in another passage from The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness:

Blessed be the God of Israel with all his holy purpose and all his faithful works. And blessed be all his hosts in righteousness, who know him by faith.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Rom. 1:17; 3:11; and Phil. 3:29.

<sup>2</sup>The translation of Burrows, op. cit., p. 368.

<sup>3</sup>The translation of Burrows, op. cit., p. 397. The passage is from section 10, taken from column 11.

<sup>4</sup>See the Damascus Document 9:50-54 and discussion on pp. 144-145.

<sup>5</sup>The translation of Burrows, op. cit., p. 399, section 12, column 13. This blessing is immediately followed by a curse upon Belial.



In the Thanksgiving Psalms, as one might expect to find, while God's wrath is mentioned,<sup>1</sup> the keynote is one of thankfulness. Psalm 6 has such passages as:

I thank thee, O Lord,  
because thou hast redeemed my soul from the pit;  
from the Sheol of Abaddon  
thou hast brought me up to an eternal height,  
and I walk in an unsearchable plain.

. . .  
Thou has purified the perverse spirit of a great sin,  
to stand in his place with the army of the holy ones,  
and to come together with the congregation of the sons of  
heaven. . . .<sup>2</sup>

It is God who redeems; it is God who has purified the spirit of sin. The latter part of Psalm 7 gives clear expression as to the conviction of the sinfulness of man, man's inability to establish himself, God's righteousness, and God's love and mercy which is the hope of man. The latter part of the Psalm reads:

I know that righteousness does not belong to a man,  
nor to a son of man blamelessness of conduct;  
A man's way is not established  
except by the spirit which God created for him  
to make blameless a way for the sons of man,

. . .  
Then I said, "For my transgression  
I am left outside of thy covenant."  
But when I remembered the strength of thy hand  
together with the abundance of thy mercy,  
I rose and stood up, and my spirit became strong,  
standing firm before affliction;  
for I leaned on thy steadfast love  
and thy abundant mercy.<sup>3</sup>

In Psalm 11, God is again given credit for such good as  
we do:<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 414, in Psalm 16.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 404.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 407-408.

<sup>4</sup>Compare Eph. 2:10-10; Phil. 2:13; John 17:6, 12.

. . .  
 Thou hast established my heart in thy teachings and in thy truth,  
 to direct my steps to the paths of righteousness,  
 that I might walk before thee in the region of life,  
 to the path of glory and peace.<sup>1</sup>

Again in Psalm 12, salvation is ascribed to God and to God alone, who saves even in the face of man's sin:

I thank thee, O Lord, because thou hast made me wise in thy truth,  
 and in thy wondrous mysteries hast given me knowledge;  
 in thy steadfast love for a sinful man,  
 in the abundance of thy mercy for one whose heart is perverted.  
 Who is like thee among the gods, O Lord?  
 Who is like thy truth?  
 Who will be justified before thee when he is judged?  
 There is no spirit that can reply to thy accusation,  
 and none is able to stand before thy wrath.  
 But all the sons of thy truth thou wilt bring in pardon before thee,  
 cleansing them from their transgressions  
 in the abundance of thy goodness and the greatness of thy mercy,  
 to make them stand before thee to the ages of eternity.  
 . . .<sup>2</sup>

The last Psalm to be cited is number 16, wherein God's wrath is mentioned, but the emphasis is upon his goodness and mercy. Moreover, the Psalm closes on the high note that it is for God's own glory that he has taken the initiative to cleanse man from transgression:

. . .  
 In thy wrath are all judgments of affliction;  
 in thy goodness is abundance of pardon  
 and mercy for all the sons of thy good pleasure.  
 . . .  
 For thy glory's sake thou hast cleansed man from transgression,  
 to consecrate himself to thee  
 from all unclean abominations and guilt of unfaithfulness;

---

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, op. cit., p. 410.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 410.

to unite himself with the sons of thy truth  
and to be in the same lot with thy holy ones.<sup>1</sup>

So while there are admittedly differences between the theological viewpoint of this material and the writings of Paul and John, these other works, especially the Thanksgiving Psalms, reinforce the viewpoint of the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document that it is God who takes the initiative in the salvation of men, and that while the wrath of God is to be realistically considered on occasion, God forgives and saves even in the face of human sin. Even our good works are rooted in the activity of God, and they do not merit salvation. He saves in the wondrous mystery of his mercy,<sup>2</sup> and for his own glory's sake,<sup>3</sup> he saves.

### C. Conclusions

Regarding the usage of  $\text{רפך}$ , usually, though not in every case, God is active and man is passive. And not only is it God who is the subject of  $\text{רפך}$ ; he takes the initiative in making atonement. Obedience to the law is important, not all ritual is abolished, and the wrath of God is taken seriously and realistically. Yet the emphasis is on the mercy and love of God.

At times the community is afraid God will be too merciful toward the men of Belial. More often an expression of thanks is offered for God's unmerited graciousness towards

---

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 414.

<sup>2</sup>Damascus Document 5:5.

<sup>3</sup>Thanksgiving Psalm 16.



men, even while they are steeped in sin. Ultimately, good works are even ascribed to God. Of necessity, <sup>7D3?</sup> is often rendered into English in the Scrolls with "forgive" or "pardon," not "propitiate."

Specifically, regarding the Scrolls' contribution to our understanding of Pauline and Johannine theology, the following quotations pinpoint the major points of positive gain:

The point of prime importance here is that while man has no righteousness of his own, there is a righteousness which God, in his own righteousness, freely confers. The meaning of the righteousness of God in Romans 3:21-26 is thus illustrated and shown to be rooted in pre-Christian Judaism.<sup>1</sup>

However, the idiom (referring to the usage of 7D3 in the Manual of Discipline) is to be interpreted with regard to God; it doubtless contributed to the Christian doctrine of divine initiative in atonement (Rom. 3:24 f.; 5:11; II Cor. 5:18 ff.; I Jn. 4:10).<sup>2</sup>

Even the most striking parallels between the Johannine literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls involve little that is peculiar to them. . . . What may be said without any exaggeration is that the Gospel and epistles of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls reflect the same general background of sectarian Judaism. The scrolls thus show--and this has not always been recognized--that we do not have to look outside of Palestinian Judaism for the soil in which the Johannine theology grew.<sup>3</sup>

In short, this material emphasizes the Jewish background of the theology of Paul and John, and further minimizes the need to look to Greek thought for the key to the content of Pauline and Johannine thought. W. F. Albright has concluded one article on these Scrolls as follows:

In my opinion the new discoveries prove that New Testament Christianity was even more intimately related to parent

<sup>1</sup>Burrows, op. cit., p. 334.

<sup>2</sup>Brownlee, op. cit., p. 45.

<sup>3</sup>Burrows, op. cit., pp. 339-340.

Judaism than we were justified in thinking before 1948. From the Christian point of view, the bond between Old and New Testament becomes historically indissoluble. . . .<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>W. F. Albright, "Not Likely to Change Beliefs," pp. 19-20 in a series of essays on "The Dead Sea Scrolls," pp. 12-25, by Miller Burrows, Edward P. Arbez, Amos N. Wilder, Frank M. Cross, Jr., W. F. Albright, Gustave Weigel, William H. Brownlee, R. B. Y. Scott, James Muilenburg, and H. L. Ginsberg in The New Republic, April 9, 1956, Vol. 134, No. 15, Issue 2159, p. 20.

## Chapter IV

### GREEK EVIDENCE

#### A. Greek Religious Background

The attitudes of the Greeks to their gods should be considered, if only briefly, in order to see the background for the non-biblical and Hellenistic Greek usage of ἱλασμός, ἱλαστήριον, and other members of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group of words.

The Homeric literature not only furnishes the earliest instances of ἱλάσκεσθαι words but it is also the classic expression of early Greek religious thought. The contrast between the God of Israel and the gods of Greece can be easily drawn from this observation of James Adam regarding the Homeric gods:

In respect of their lower as well as of their higher qualities, the Homeric Gods are magnified men.

A scarcely less inadequate apprehension of the divine character sometimes reveals itself in Homer's account of the dealings of God with man. . . . for the Iliad and Odyssey abound in episodes where misfortune and calamity are due to the immediate agency of Gods, without, so far as we can see, any moral justification or any prospect of redress either now or in the world to come.<sup>1</sup>

This all too human nature of the gods, prone to be angry with men, caused propitiatory sacrifices to be a prominent

---

<sup>1</sup>James Adam, The Religious Teachers of Greece (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), p. 36. And on p. 40 Adam adds: "We make a grave mistake if we regard these and similar delineations of the divine nature in the Homeric poems as having only a poetic or dramatic value. It is part of the tragedy of Homeric life that they were believed to be true."



part of the worship services:

In the Greek divine world were many powerful spirits who were easily offended, be it by too much prosperity, by neglect, or for some reason not clear to men. If their anger could be anticipated and allayed, its effects might be allayed, its effects might be escaped; accordingly propitiatory sacrifices were offered before important undertakings and even at regular intervals.<sup>1</sup>

The nature of such propitiatory sacrifices is plainly an activity of man to appease the god or gods. However, even propitiatory sacrifices were no guarantee that the god would be gracious,<sup>2</sup> and such ungracious gods may have caused the people to be especially receptive to various mystery religions, such as Orphism.<sup>3</sup>

Though Orphism had its spiritual side, it was also concerned with the expiation of sin. Plato complains at this point:

Mendicant priests and soothsayers visit the gates of the rich, and persuade them that they have acquired from the Gods by means of sacrifices and charms the power to heal with pleasures and festal rites whatever sin has been committed by a man himself or by his ancestors.<sup>4</sup>

However, while Plato condemned any attempt by the rich to propitiate the gods by "what may be termed the purchase of

<sup>1</sup>Arthur Fairbanks, "Propitiation, Greek," pp. 397-398 in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918), X, 398.

<sup>2</sup>Arthur Fairbanks, "Expiation and Atonement, Greek," pp. 651-653 in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 652: ". . . from the Homeric point of view neither gifts nor sacrifices had much efficacy; the affront to the gods was certain to bring punishment."

<sup>3</sup>Adam, op. cit., p. 98: "Like Buddhism and Christianity, Orphism was a religion of deliverance, of salvation: . . ."

<sup>4</sup>Plato, The Republic, II, 364 B. ff., cited by Adam, op. cit., pp. 103-104.

indulgences,"<sup>1</sup> he offered no joyous message of the gods' graciously taking the initiative in saving mankind. Rather, his view was that "the only assurance of salvation for the human spirit lies in ceasing to do evil and learning to do well."<sup>2</sup> Here again is a kind of salvation by works wrought by man, though Plato is advocating moral works rather than cultic practices. Commenting on Plato's position, Campbell has criticized it as follows:

Yet perhaps these utterances may also serve to indicate wherein the highest philosophy may fall short, when seeking to provide a religion for humanity. The Eleusinian mystic, the Orphic preacher, and even the juggling priest of Sabazius had an inkling of human needs and requirements, which the intellectual scorn of Plato overlooked: disorders which they contented themselves with healing slightly, in their ignorance of a more prevailing remedy.<sup>3</sup>

The heterogenous<sup>2</sup> state of religious thought in Greece in its Hellenistic period, especially the period of the writing of the New Testament, with the conflicting ideas of the gods as benevolent and as angry, and with cultic means as opposed to only moral deportment advocated as means of winning divine good will, i.e., propitiating the gods, is summed up by Büchsel:

Neben dem Glauben an die Erforderlichkeit solcher kultischen Mittel zur Gewinnung oder Wiedergewinnung des göttlichen Wohlwollens treten schon ziemlich früh Ausserungen der Überzeugung, dass es nur auf sittliche Haltung bzw Gesinnung ankommt. Die Aufklärung erschütterte die mythischen Vorstellungen von der Gottheit und den Toten. Der Gedanke vom Neide der Gottheit ist seit Plato ausdrücklich abgelehnt.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lewis Campbell, Religion in Greek Literature (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898), p. 251.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

Die Gottheit wurde als ihrem Wesen nach wohlwollend gedacht. Damit verloren die καθαρμοί und ελασμοί an Bedeutung oder erhielten sich nur kraft Umgestaltung und Umdeutung ins Ethische und Psychologische. Im Zeitalter der nt. lichen Schriften war dieser Prozess schon weit fortgeschritten, wenn auch in den verschiedenen Schichten in verschiedenem Grade. Andererseits waren aus dem Orient barbarische, besonders blutige Sühnriten usw in die griechische Frömmigkeit eingedrungen. Die Furcht vor der Gottheit und ihrem Gericht war durchaus nicht ausgestorben.<sup>1</sup>

## B. ἰλάσκεσθαι and Related Forms

### 1. Miscellaneous Forms

While ελαστήριον, ελασμός, and a few other forms may deserve special consideration, several other members of the ἰλάσκεσθαι group of words deserve some attention. While no single instance is of great importance, the accumulative weight of these various word usages at least establishes a certain color or atmosphere for this group of words.

Liddell and Scott<sup>2</sup> indicate usages for several less important members of the ἰλάσκεσθαι group of words:

ἐξιλασις, εως, ῆ: "propitiation, atonement."<sup>3</sup>

ἐξιλασμός, ος: "propitiation, atonement."<sup>4</sup>

ἐξιλαστήριος, ον: "propitiatory."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Büchsel, TWNT, III, 312, ll. 33-45.

<sup>2</sup> LSGL, p. 594.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. References cited include: Diogenes Laertius 1.110 (iii. A.D.?) and Iamblichus de Mysteriis 1.13 (iv. A.D.).

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. References cited include: Proclus Paraphrasis Ptolemaei Tetrabiblou 24 (v. A.D.).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. The reference is to an instance of the neuter plural in a scholium on an expression in the Argonautics of Apollonius Rhodius, II, 485 f. (iii. B.C.).

And while Liddell and Scott have strong support from James Morison, op. cit., pp. 299-300, for considering the word an adjective with the usage of "propitiatory," Meyer (Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, translated, revised, and edited with the sanction of the author by William P. Dickson, Part IV, The



ἑξιλαστικός, ἡ, ὄν : "propitiatory."<sup>1</sup>

ἑξιλεόω : "appease."<sup>2</sup>

ἑξιλέωμα, ατος, τό : "ransom, propitiatory offering."<sup>3</sup>

ἑξιλέωσις, εως, ἡ : "propitiation, atonement."<sup>4</sup>

ἑξιλεωτός, ἡ, ὄν : "appeasable."<sup>5</sup>

ἱλάσιμος, ον : "placable."<sup>6</sup>

Epistle to the Romans, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879), pp. 171-172) considers the word a substantive with the usage "expiatory sacrifice" and explaining the phrase λωφῆν ἱερά, Morison considers the word as explaining καταπαυστικά τῆς ὀργῆς.

Deissmann, in "ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ und ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 198, considers the word a substantive rather than an adjective but gives it a general instrumental usage, as Morison, rather than a more specific usage as Meyer. He says that it means "Sühnungsmittel" and cites as a parallel example καταπαυστήριον with the usage of "Beschwichtigungsmittel." Καταπαυστήριον incidentally is given by LSGL, p. 904, as a neuter noun with the usage, "means of putting to rest."

But whether a noun or an adjective, and whether it has a general usage of "means of propitiation" or a more specific reference inherent in it to sacrifice, the idea of propitiation is with all students, admitted as part of the usage of the word.

<sup>1</sup>LSGL, p. 594. The usage given is the same as for ἑξιλαστήριος. The references cited are Cornutus in de Natura Deorum 32 (i. A.D.) and a scholium on Aeschylus' Septem contra Thebas 268 (vi./v. B.C.).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. References cited include Heliodorus 4.15, 1.8 (iii. A.D.), Strabo 4.4.6 (i. B.C./i. A.D.), Onosander (i. A.D.), Hermogenes Stat. 3 (ii. A.D.), Zenobius 4.93 (ii. A.D.), Julianus Imperator Orationes 2.68b (iv. A.D.). With these references comprising a span of five centuries and six authors, it is all the more striking that the only usage assigned to the word is "appease." ἑξιλεόω, however, is not so closely related to either ἑξιλαστήριον or ἑξιασμός as several other words in the ἱλάσκεσθαι group.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. This word is considered by Liddell and Scott to have the same usage as ἑξίλασμα, ατος, τό, where the two examples given are to the LXX. The reference is to the lexicographer, Hesychius (v. A.D.?) under ἀποτροπίασμα.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. The references are to a scholium in Aeschylus' Persae 229 (vi./v. B.C.) and to the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. The reference is again to the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 828. The one reference cited is to Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (Imperator) 12.14 (ii. A.D.). And here the adjective is given as modifying πρόνοια.

ἱλάσμα, ατος, τό: "propitiation."<sup>1</sup>

Without pressing any single instance, the general impression of this group of words and the usages given by Liddell and Scott is that the concept, quality, or action common to all the words is "propitiate." This is true of ἐξιλαστήριος where the word describes the action and/or the sacrifices in regard to a nymph,<sup>2</sup> and it is true of ἱλάσιμος where the word modifies πρόνοια.<sup>3</sup>

## 2. ἱλεως

ἱλεως is a remote relative of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group of words. ἱλεως is the Attic form of ἱλαος.<sup>4</sup> The word is much more common than other members of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group,<sup>5</sup> and both in stem and in meaning is related to ἱλαρός.<sup>6</sup>

Usually in secular Greek and also in the Septuagint, as in Hebrews 8:12, the word has the usage with gods or God of "propitious, gracious," of men "gracious, kindly," and of things "propitious, blameless."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. The reference is to an oraculum quoted in Phlegon Trallianus' Macrobi 4 (11. A.D.).

<sup>2</sup>James Morison, op. cit., p. 300.

<sup>3</sup>LSGL, p. 828.

<sup>4</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 300, line 29; LSGL, p. 827; Robertson, op. cit., p. 62.

<sup>5</sup>Compare the numerous examples of usage given for ἱλεως both in LSGL, in loc., and in Bauer, op. cit., in loc., with the few examples given for some of the other ἱλάσκεσθαι words.

Büchsel also states, TWNT, III, 300, line 29: "ἱλεως ist attische Form zu ἱλαος das seit Homer oft vorkommt."

<sup>6</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 300, line 30.

<sup>7</sup>LSGL, p. 827.

And in like manner, Bauer, op. cit., col. 681: "gnädig, huldvoll, meist - in uns. Lit., wie LXX, stets - von Gott . . ."

So also TWNT, III, p. 300, line 29 ff.

Büchsel does observe that while the form  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\tau\upsilon$  with the gods as the object does occur in Plato, it is not found in the Septuagint. Rather in the Septuagint  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  occurs only as the predicate of God.<sup>1</sup>

While  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  appears a few times in secular Greek, as well as in the Septuagint and Matt. 18:22 as a form of call or wish,<sup>2</sup> Büchsel observes that  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  has not yet been proved to exist in secular Greek as a form of negative protestation with the same deprecatory use as in Biblical Greek.<sup>3</sup>

Because of the absence of the word in the Pauline and

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 300-301: "Die Götter gnädig zu machen ( $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\tau\upsilon$ ) ist eine der Aufgaben des Kultus Plat Leg X 910a.

"In Septuaginta kommt  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  nur als Prädikat Gottes . . .  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\upsilon\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\tau\upsilon$  udgl kommt nicht vor."

Regarding usage in the Septuagint, see pp. 53-57.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 303: "For the phrase in Mt. 18:22 (cf. LXX Gen. 43:23, 2 Kings 20:20, I Chr. 11:19) see Cagnat I. 107:10  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\iota$ ,  $\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\iota$  and OGIS 721:10 (iv. A.D.) (= Letronne 221)  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta\alpha$  with the other exx. in Proleg. p. 240, where the deprecatory meaning is compared with our vernacular expression, 'Mercy on us!'"

Robertson, op. cit., p. 80, goes so far as to list  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  and even  $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$  among words in a list prefaced by this statement: "Many words which were thought to have a peculiar meaning in the LXX or the N.T. have been found in that very sense in the inscriptions or papyri. . . ."

<sup>3</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 301, lines 5-8: " $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ (\mu\omicron\iota)$  in Verbindung mit einem Götternamen kommt im heidnischen Griechisch zwar mitunter vor, als Anrufungs-, Wunsch- und Grues-Formel, aber als Formel der Abwehr oder negativen Beteuerung ist es nicht nachgewiesen." And in a footnote Büchsel adds: "JHMoulton, in: Class Rev 15(1901) 436 zeigt deutlich, dass die für  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\iota$  . . . nachgewiesenen Stellen (aus AJLetronne, Recueil des Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de l'Egypte II (1848) 286, 211 usw) the deprecatory use in the biblical passages eben nicht haben; und das ist der entscheidende Punkt, der meist nicht ausreichend beachtet wird. . . ."



Johannine writings, because of its relatively remote relationship to *ελάσκεσθαι*, and more especially *ελαστήριον* and *ελασμός*, and because of the very wide application of the word both in secular Greek and in the Septuagint, it does not advance our study very much.

### 3. *Ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* and *ελάσκεσθαι*

Lexicographers in general agree with Büchsel that "*ελάσκομαι* hat von Homer an oft zum Subjekt Menschen, zum Objekt eine Gottheit, einen Verstorbenen, bedeutet also: gnädig machen."<sup>1</sup> However, Yerkes has recently maintained

---

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 314, lines 34-35. And in a footnote reference is made to "Od 3, 419: *ὄφρ' ἦτοι πρώτιστα θεῶν ἐλάσσομ' Ἀθήνην*. Il 1, 386; 2, 550."

*LSGL*, p. 828, gives as one usage of *ελάσκομαι* "appease" and immediately adds: "in Hom. always of gods, . . . Il. 1. 386, cf. 100, al., Od. 3.419; Il. 1.472; . . . Il. 1.147." And other examples of this usage include Hesiodus *Opera et Dies* 338 (iii. B.C.), Pindarus *Olympian Odes* 7.9 (v. B.C.), Menander *Epit.* 558 (iv./iii. B.C.), and also Herodotus 5.47 (v. B.C.) where reference is to the dead as heroized.

Bauer, *op. cit.*, and *TLNT* also tend to concur in this view as do Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*, where on p. 303, *ad loc.*, it is stated, "For this verb = 'render propitious to oneself' c. acc. of the person, as in classical Greek, see *Syll.* 641.5 ff. (end of iii./B.C.) . . . , and *Michel* 1211.5 (1./B.C.?) . . . : cf. Menander *Epitrepontes* 664," which appears to be the same passage *LSGL* list as *Epit.* 558. And Moulton and Milligan *op. cit.*, add: "A similar use of the compound *ἐξιλάσκομαι* which extends to the LXX (Gen 32.20 (Jacob and Esau), Zech. 7.2 (God): cf. Thackeray *Gr.* 1. p. 270), is seen in Menander *Fragm.* p. 164, No. 544.6 . . ."

In fact it may be observed that H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, Editio Nova Auction et Emendation, London, In Aedibus Valpianis, Prostat Etiam. Apud Bibliopolas Londinenses, Cantabrigienses, Edinenses, Oxonienses, et Dublinenses, 1822, Vol. IV, Col. 4479C-4482C, which is the principal place where *ελάσκομαι* and its cognates are discussed, never uses "expio" to describe any instance other than a few examples from the LXX and New Testament. The word is usually described with a form of "propitio" or "placeo."

that on occasion the verb can mean "beseech," "worship," or "invoke"<sup>1</sup> and suggests "worship" as a more basic usage of the word in secular Greek, though he admits that "worship" could on occasion also be "propitiation."<sup>2</sup> Cremer, too, believes that "in general the word meant to worship";<sup>3</sup> however, he believes that the verb represents "at the bottom, a procedure by which something is to be made good" and feels that it "is a synonym with ἀρέσκειν - to appease any one, . . ."<sup>4</sup> Hence he agrees with Nägelsbach that the general usage of the verb, "to worship," "indicates that good will was not conceived to be the original and natural condition of the gods, but something that must first be earned."<sup>5</sup> Büchsel, too, is aware that ἐλάσκομαι has a more general usage of "worship."<sup>6</sup> Yet he maintains that the basic meaning is "to make gracious," meaning upon occasion with men as the object of "to bribe."<sup>7</sup> Moreover, he states: "In

---

And in like manner LSGL, p. 828, regarding ἐλάσκομαι. The usage of every secular Greek instance cited is given as "appease" or "conciliate." Such usages as "expiate," "to be merciful, gracious" are found to be illustrated only by citations from the New Testament or LXX.

<sup>1</sup>Verkes, op. cit., pp. 51-53. He cites as examples: Iliad 1. 472-474, Odyssey 11.419, Aeschylus' Suppliants 117, 128, and Appollonius of Rhodes' Argonauts 1.1093, 1139.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 52: "When a god is thought of as angry because of this neglect, men might try to worship him, thinking the worship would be pleasing and thus avert his anger by repairing a neglect."

<sup>3</sup>BTL, p. 302.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, p. 315, lines 1-2: "ἐλάσκεισθαι kann geradz parallel zu θεραπεύειν stehen." And he cites Xenophon's Oeconomicus 5:20 where τοὺς θεοὺς ἐλάσκεισθαι stands parallel to τοὺς θεοὺς θεραπεύειν.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., lines 4-7. The reference cited is Herodotus VIII 112, 2: Πάριοι δὲ θεμιστοκλέα χρήμασιν ἐλάσμενοι διέφυγον τὸ στράτευμα.

dieser Bedeutung: gnädig machen lässt sich *ἐλάσκεσθαι* bis in späte Zeit verfolgen bei Heiden, Juden und Christen."<sup>1</sup>

#### a. Secular Greek

In addition to the secular Greek, references given by Büchsel where the usage is "to make gracious" can be added passages by Plutarch,<sup>2</sup> Herodotus,<sup>3</sup>

BFL, p. 302, also cites this quotation as an example of where *ἐλάσκεσθαι* has the usage "to bribe."

LSGL, in loc., considers the verb in this instance to have the usage of "conciliate."

Büchsel, TWNT, III, 315, lines 2-3.

The references to secular usage are as follows:

"Dio Chrys Or 4, 90: μῆνιν ἑκάτης ἐλασκόμενοι. Paus III 13, 3: θυσίαις ἐλάσκονται (den Apollon) vgl Polyb 3, 112, 9: καὶ θεοὺς ἐξιλάσασθαι καὶ ἀνθρώπους, 1, 68, 4: σπονδάζοντες ἐξιλάσασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν αὐτῶν. 32, 15 (27, 25) 7: διὰ τοῦτων (Opfer) ἐξιλάσασθαι τὸ θεόν. In den bei Steinleitner gesammelten kleinasiatischen Inschriften finden sich ἐλάσκομαι in dieser Bdtg in 4, 6; 5, 6; 6, 16; 8, 9; 10, 9; 25, 6, 7; 33, 5 vgl auch das S 73 angeführte Menanderfragment: τὴν θεὸν ἐξιλάσαντο."

The only specific reference given to Jewish thought is Josephus' Ant. 6, 124. However, Bauer would group in this same category Josephus' Ant. 8, 112 (which is listed by Brooke Foss Westcott, The Epistles of St. John: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays, 3d ed. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892), p. 87, f.n. 1, as VIII. 4, 3) Philo (20 B.C.-50 A.D.) De Specialibus Legibus 1.116, and the Sibylline Oracles 3, 625, 628, which are discussed on p. 106.

<sup>2</sup>LSGL, p. 594, lists an instance in 2.149d where ἐξιλάσκομαι has the usage of "propitiate" and the object τὸ μῆνιμα.

Büchsel, TWNT, III, 314, f.n. 61, lists De iis qui sero a numine puniunt, where the object is "eine Verstorbene."

Both Büchsel and Cremer, BFL, in loc., list De Antonio 67:3 (I 947d) where Caesar is the object of ἐλάσκεσθαι and the verb has the usage of "propitiate"; also see De Catone Minore 61:3 (I 789e) ἐλασάμενοι τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν τοῦ Καίσαρος; and Poplicola 21:3 (I 108a) ἐλασάμενος τῷ Ἄιδῃ where the person having been made gracious has in this later usage come to stand in the dative.

<sup>3</sup>LSGL, p. 594, cites Dia Oraculum, quoted by Herodotus 7.141. See also Herodotus VI. 105, cited by Cremer and Büchsel in addition to the previously cited VIII. 112.2 on p. 161 and V. 47 on p. 160.



Xenophon,<sup>1</sup> and Plato.<sup>2</sup> And Büchsel indicates that in a few instances the presupposition is not that the god is angry or that man has committed a sin.<sup>3</sup>

A few passages merit closer attention, namely those which C. H. Dodd cites to illustrate his contention that in addition to the usage "placate" and "propitiate" in secular Greek, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι "also bears the sense 'expiate,' with an impersonal object."<sup>4</sup>

First he cites Plato, Laws (or Leges) 862c, where the Greek reads τὸ ἀποίνους ἐξιλασθὲν τοῖς δρῶσιν καὶ πάσχουσιν ἐκάστας τῶν βλάβεων ἐκ διαφορᾶς εἰς φιλίαν αἰεὶ πειρατέον καθιστάναι τοὺς νόμους.<sup>5</sup> Jowett translates the Greek as follows: "And when compensation is given, the law must always seek to win over the doers and sufferers of

<sup>1</sup>Cyropaëda VII. 2:19: πάμπολλα δὲ θῶν ἐξιλασάμην ποτὲ αὐτόν where the purpose is to incline Apollo to deliver an oracle.

<sup>2</sup>LSGL cites a passage from Plato's Phaedo 95e where ἐξιλάσκεσθαι is used of men with the usage "conciliate." However, B. Jowett in The Dialogues of Plato, Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions, 4 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), Vol. IV, in loc., translates the Greek with "propitiate."

<sup>3</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 314, lines 35-36: Dabei ist die Voraussetzung nicht immer, dass die Gottheit zürnt oder der Mensch Sünde getan hat . . ." And in f.n. 62 this is elaborated as follows: "Hdt VI 105: καὶ αὐτόν (Pan) ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἀγγελίης θοοίησι ἐπετείουσι καὶ λαμπάδι ἐλάσκονται. Pan nennt sich ausdrücklich den Athenern εὖνους vermisst nur seinen Kultus in ihnen. Vgl. auch die Beschreibung des Aphroditekultus bei Empedokles fr 128 (I 271, 24 Diels): εὖσεβέεσσιν ἀγάλμασιν ἐλάσκοντα. Epigr. Græc 1027, 4: οἱ πολλὰ γεγηθότες (fröhlich!) ἐλάσκονται οὐν σθένος (Asklepios)."

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 82.

<sup>5</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 317, f.n. 75.

the several hurts from feelings of enmity to those of friendship."<sup>1</sup> Jowett, in translating ἐξιλασθέν by a form of "give," has gone far afield from both "propitiate" and "expiate." But the sentence as a whole makes it clear that the total process is conceived of as one of personal reconciliation and not merely expiation. Büchsel, while recognizing that ἐξιλασθέν can be understood as "entsündigt," believes it is better understood as "begütigt" with the purpose being to cause the injured party to give up his wrath.<sup>2</sup> In other words, he feels that ἐξιλασθέν has more the sense of "propitiate" than to "expiate."<sup>3</sup>

The second example given by Dodd is to "Ditt. Syll."<sup>4</sup> 1042, ὅς δ' ἂν πολυπραγμονήσῃ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιεχάσῃται, ἁμαρτίαν ὀφειλέτω Μηνὶ Τυράννῳ ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνῃται ἐξιλάσασθαι ."<sup>4</sup> And not only citing this instance but

<sup>1</sup>Jowett, *op. cit.*, IV, 375.

<sup>2</sup>Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 317, f.n. 75: " . . . könnte man ἐξιλασθέν verstehen als: entsündigt, sofern der Rechtbrecher durch die Busse, die er dem Geschädigten bezahlt, schuldfrei geworden ist; besser aber wird es als: begütigt verstanden, so fern der Geschädigte durch die entrichtete Busse zum Aufgeben des Zornes gegen den Schädiger gebracht ist, worauf hier dann beide zur Freundschaft untereinander kommen können."

One difference in the numbering systems of Jowett and Büchsel is noted. This passage is listed by Jowett as part of Book IX, while Büchsel lists it as part of Book VIII. Both refer to it however as 862.

<sup>3</sup>Morris, "The Use of ἐλάσκεσθαι," p. 227, is apparently of this opinion too, for he states: "Thus Plat. *Legg.* viii. 862c is interpreted by Büchsel as referring to a person, not a thing."

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, p. 82. Ditt. Syll.<sup>3</sup> refers to W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*<sup>2</sup> (1898ff); (1915ff).

also "Ditt. Syll.<sup>3</sup> 1365:32," Büchsel concludes that this form is apparently traditional in the Asia Minor Men cultus and that Dittenberger has established "fordissima sermonis vitia."<sup>1</sup>

This instance is important, for ἁμαρτίαν in the accusative is the object of ἐξιλάσασθαι, similar to Heb. 2:17. And after citing this example, Moulton and Milligan observe:

This last ex. from a profane source should perhaps make us careful in not pressing too far the theological implications which are sometimes found in the grammatical constructions of the verb in Biblical Greek (cf. e.g. Westcott Epp. of St. John, p. 83 ff.).<sup>2</sup>

Deissmann has also criticized Gremer for pressing the distinctions between classical and Biblical Greek too hard.<sup>3</sup> Yet Gremer is aware that even when God is not the object of the verb, the action of the verb has a relation to God and on occasion was to turn away the wrath of God.<sup>4</sup>

Moulton and Milligan, recognizing that ἐξιλάσασθαι in the Men Tyrannus inscription has as its object ἁμαρτίαν and not God, still use the word "propitiation" in their discussion of the usage of the verb here.<sup>5</sup> Since this

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 317, f.n. 75: "... Die seit Deissmann NB 52 oft angeführten Inschriftstellen IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366, 16 (Ditt Syll<sup>3</sup> 1042, 16) vgl 1365, 32: ... gehört ins 2 oder 3 Jhdt n Chr, ist also 3 - 400 Jahre jünger als die LXX. Die Formel ist, wie ihr zweimaliges Vorkommen beweist, im Men-Kultus herkömmlich, also kleinasiatisch. Beachtung verdient aber, dass Dittenberger in diesen Inschriften foedissima sermonis vitia feststellt. ..."

<sup>2</sup>Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 303.

<sup>3</sup>Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 224-225.

<sup>4</sup>BTL, p. 303.

<sup>5</sup>Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 303. "Both in the LXX (e.g. Ps 78(79)<sup>9</sup>) and NT (Lk 18:13) ἐξιλάσασθαι is found



inscription is dated in the second or third century after Christ,<sup>1</sup> it is possible that this construction was due to the influence of the Septuagint or New Testament.<sup>2</sup>

Consequently, even though "compensation" or "sins" may grammatically be the object of the verb in the instances cited by Dodd, there is good reason to believe that the ultimate purpose of the action represented by the verb was "reconciliation" or "propitiation." In any event, "there can be no dispute but that in an overwhelming majority of passages this word group denotes propitiation."<sup>3</sup>

#### b. Jewish Writers

##### (1) Strabo

Among Jewish writers, Strabo<sup>4</sup> clearly uses these words with the idea of "propitiation":

In the ocean, he (Poseidonius) says, there is a small island, not very far out to sea, situated off the outlet of the Liger River; and the island is inhabited by the women of the Samnites, and they are possessed by Dionysus and make this god propitious by appeasing him with mystic initiations as well as other sacred performances; . . .<sup>5</sup>

---

in the pass. c. dat. == "be propitious," "be merciful," while the striking use of the verb c. acc. of the thing for which propitiation is made in Heb. 2<sup>17</sup> . . . can be illustrated from the use of the compound not only in such LXX passages as Sir 3<sup>3</sup> al., but in an inser. belonging to the Imperial period found near Sunium, where in the directions for a sanctuary in honour of the God Men Tyrannus, the words occur: . . . See also Morris, "The Use of *ελάσκεισθαι*," p. 227.

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 317, f.n. 75.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, lines 8-9. "Freilich Belege dafür, dass die Verben vor der LXX die Bedeutung *entsündigen*, *sühnen* gehabt hätten, gibt es nicht." And this point is elaborated in f.n. 75, parts of which have already been cited.

<sup>3</sup>Morris, "The Use of *ελάσκεισθαι*," p. 227.

<sup>4</sup>*TLNT*, p. xiv, lists Strabo as having been born 66 B.C. and dying 24 A.D.

<sup>5</sup>Horace Leonard Jones, *The Geography of Strabo with an English Translation*, In Eight Volumes (London: William Heinemann, 1923), in the *LCL*, II, 249. The passage is in 4.4.6.

And the Greek for the latter part of the above citation reads:

καὶ ἱλασκομένας τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον τελευτᾷς τε  
καὶ ἄλλαις ἱεροποιΐαις ἐξιλεοῦμένας. — — —.

(2) Josephus

The instance in Josephus' Antiquities 12.2.14 where ἐξιλάσκετο indicates the eventually successful attempt of Theopompus to propitiate the God of Israel has already been discussed.<sup>2</sup> However, it cannot be said that Josephus would assume a Jew would not try to appease or propitiate God.

In fact in his Antiquities 6.6.5 these words are put into the mouth of King Saul:

' . . . Aye and I swear by God Himself that verily, be it my own son Jonathan who hath committed this sin, I will slay him and thus propitiate God (καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὕτως ἱλάσασθαι), even as though it were from a stranger without kinship with me that I was taking vengeance on His behalf.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 248.

See also 4.1.13 where ἐξιλασκόμενους τὸν θεόν appears in this connection: "although the people (the Tectosages), in trying to consecrate them and propitiate the god, added thereto out of their personal properties, and it was on account of having laid hands on them that Caepio ended his life in misfortunes . . ." Greek is on p. 206; English is on p. 207. Strabo 4.1.13 is also listed by Bauer, op. cit., col. 499, as an example where ἐξιλάσκει has the usage "aussöhnen, versöhnen."

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 98.

<sup>3</sup>H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, Josephus with an English Translation, in Nine Volumes, Vol. V, Jewish Antiquities, Books V-VIII, in LCL, p. 229. The Greek is cited from p. 228, where it is noted that Naber's text reads ἱλάσεσθαι.

TLNT, p. 301, gives the same reading as Thackeray and Marcus; Bauer, op. cit., col. 680, abbreviates ἱ.

Büchsel, TWNT, III, 315, f.n. 66, reads ἐξιλάσασθαι. All agree the word has the usage of "make gracious, appease, or propitiate."

And in a like manner in the Antiquities 8.4.3 (or 8: 112) Josephus has King Solomon say, speaking of the gift of

In The Jewish War 5.1.4 (or 5.19), after describing the civil war in Jerusalem where some Jews killed other Jews even while they were worshipping in the temple, Josephus himself calls out, speaking to the city of Jerusalem: "Yet might there be hopes for an amelioration of thy lot, if ever thou wouldst propitiate that God who devastated thee!"<sup>1</sup> There could be no clear example of a verb indicating action that is to be performed by man with God as the object and the purpose being to make God more friendly.

### (3) Philo

Philo<sup>2</sup> also uses these verbs and with a wider range of usage than either Josephus or Strabo. Several times it has the usage of making gracious, propitiation, or placation with the subject man and the object God,<sup>3</sup> and with Philo approving such procedure.<sup>4</sup> The verb also has the usage of placate or

---

speech: "... for with what other thing is it more fitting for us to appease Thee when wrathful, and, when ill disposed, to make Thee gracious than with our voice, . . ." (τίνι γὰρ ἄλλῳ μᾶλλον εὐλόεσθαι μνησκόντα). The English is cited from p. 633 and the Greek from p. 632.

<sup>1</sup>H. S. J. Thackeray, Josephus with an English Translation, in Eight Volumes, III, The Jewish War, Books IV-VII, in the LCL, p. 207. The Greek for the latter part of the sentence, p. 206, reads: "εἴγε ποτὲ τὸν πορθήσαντα θεὸν εὐλόεσθαι."

<sup>2</sup>Philo lived about 20 B.C. - 50 A.D.

<sup>3</sup>On Noah's Work as a Planter (De Planatione) 162; On Abraham (De Abrahamo) 129; and Moses (De Vita Mosis) 24.

<sup>4</sup>F. H. Colson, On Abraham in Philo with an English Translation in Eleven Volumes in the LCL, VI, 67: (God is speaking) "... For I accept both him who wishes to enjoy my beneficial power and thus partake of blessings and him who propitiates (εὐλασκόμενον) the dominance and authority of the master to avoid chastisement." And in Moses II 24, VI, 461, Philo is extolling the merits of the Day of Atonement when he says that the Jews keep the holy-day, "propitiating



propitiate with the subject a man and the object a man,<sup>1</sup>  
 These verbs are also used, however, where the usage is to expiate a wrong or to absolve from guilt or ceremonial defilement.<sup>2</sup>

In a few passages, however, Philo goes further afield from the conventional Greek usage. In the Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis II, III (Legum Allegoria). III. 174,<sup>3</sup> Philo quotes the Septuagint version of Deut. 8:3:

And He (God) afflicted thee and made thee weak by hunger, and fed thee with manna, when thy fathers knew not, that He might proclaim to thee, that not on bread alone shall man live, but on every word that goeth forth through the mouth of God.

Philo adds: "This afflicting is propitiation (ἑλασμός); for on the tenth day also by afflicting our souls He makes propitiation (ἐλάσκεται) (Lev. xvi. 30). For when we are

---

the Father (ἐλασκόμενοι τὸν πατέρα) of All with fitting prayers, in which they are wont to ask that their old sins may be forgiven and new blessings gained and enjoyed."

<sup>1</sup>F. H. Colson, On the Special Laws (De Specialibus Legibus) I. 237, in Philo with an English Translation in Eleven Volumes, in the LCL, VII, 460, for the Greek and p. 461 for the English.

<sup>2</sup>See Colson and Whitaker, op. cit., II, 366-369, where On the Posterity of Cain and His Exile (De Posteritate Caini) 72 where ἐξιλάσασθαι appears.

See also Vol. VII. On the Special Laws, I, 234, pp. 236-237 where καθαρίων ἐλάσκεσθαι is translated "the purificatory propitiation should be made."

See too On the Change of Names (De Mutatione Nominum) 235, F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Philo with an English Translation, in Eleven Volumes, Vol. V (London: Williams Heinemann, Ltd., 1943), in LCL, pp. 262-263.

Büchsel, TWNT, III, 316, lines 4-6, also lists On Rewards and Punishments (De Praemia et Poenis) 56 and Moses (De Vita Mosis) II (III) 201, as examples of this usage.

<sup>3</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo with an English Translation, Vol. I (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1949) in the LCL, p. 419.

being deprived of pleasant things, we think we are being afflicted, but in reality thereby we have God propitious to us (ἐλεων τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν)."<sup>1</sup> Here God is the subject of the verb ἱλάσκεται; he is the author of the propitiation (ἱλασμός), even though it takes the form of physical affliction. Büchsel aptly observes:

Philo vertieft damit den moralistischen Gedanken: gute Werke sühnen die Sünde (Sir 3,3.30), ins Religiöse: Gott schafft durch sein Wirken am Menschen die wirkliche Reinheit von Sünde. Gott ist hier der Erlöser von der Sünde als Bindung. Der alte kultische Begriff hat sich auf dem Umweg über das Ethische ins persönlich Religiöse vertieft.<sup>2</sup>

While man is the subject and God is the object of the verb in The Special Laws, I. 116, still the high priest is viewed as a mediator also of gracious acts of God where men are the object.<sup>3</sup>

In regard to these Jewish writers, it can be said that all three use these verbs in the classical sense of "propitiate," "placate," or "make gracious," and this appears to

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. The English is cited from p. 419; the Greek is cited from p. 418.

<sup>2</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 316, lines 12-16.

See also Colson, Philo with an English Translation, Vol. VII, The Special Laws, II, 196. On p. 429, even though τὸν θεὸν ἐξευμενίζεσθαι appears in the situation of the people seeking to propitiate God, it is added: "and entertain bright hopes looking not to their own merits but to the gracious nature of Him who sets pardon before chastisement." Even though the people do perform a rite with God as the object, salvation is seen to be rooted not in their good works but in the gracious nature of God.

<sup>3</sup>Colson, Philo with an English Translation, VII, 167: "For the law desires him to be endued with a nature higher than the merely human and to approximate to the Divine, on the border-line, we may truly say, between the two, that men may have a mediator through whom they may propitiate. (ἱλάσκωνται) God and God a servitor to employ in extending the abundance of His boons to men." Compare I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 2:17; 3:1; 4:14-15; 5:5, 10; etc.

be the only sense in which Josephus and Strabo use the terms. However, in Philo a few instances appear where the verb has the usage of "expiate" or "absolve," whatever may be thought of Plato and the Men Tyrannus inscriptions. But in at least one instance, Philo goes beyond all this and shows God as the subject of the verb and designates God as the author of the *ἰλασμός*. Moreover, Philo makes it clear that men have their hope, not in their good works but in the graciousness of God. Philo has retained the idea that the action represented by *ἰλάσκεσθαι* or *ἰλασμός* is beneficial to men and causes them to feel God's graciousness rather than his wrath, but he adds the new element that in at least one instance, God is the author of this *ἰλασμός*.

#### c. Christian Writers

Büchsel cites passages in The Shepherd of Hermas and First Clement as references for his statement that *ἰλάσ-κεσθαι* still had the usage of "to make gracious" in Christian writings.<sup>1</sup> Since the author of First Clement has sometimes been identified with the Clement mentioned in Phil. 4:3<sup>2</sup> and since both these writings were written either at about the same time or within a century after the Pauline and Johannine writings,<sup>3</sup> their importance is considerable.

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, *TWNT*, p. 315, f.n. 67, to I Cl. 7,7 and Herm v. 1, 2, 1.

<sup>2</sup>Raphael M. Huber, "Clement, St., Pope of Rome (ca. 92-101) and Clementine Epistles," pp. 177-178 in *An Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Vergilius Ferm (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945), p. 177. Compare, however, E. F. Scott, *in loc.*, in the IB-XI.

<sup>3</sup>This is based on a dating of the Shepherd of Hermes at about 140 A.D. or later and of First Clement 90-100 A.D.



First Clement 7:7 reads:

Jonas announced destruction to the Ninevites: they did penance for their sins and by their prayers propitiated God (οἱ δὲ μετανοήσαντες ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν αὐτῶν ἐξιλάσαντο τὸν θεόν . . .) and gained salvation, although they were not of God's own people.<sup>1</sup>

The Shepherd of Hermas 1.2.1 reads:

After she had spoken these words the Heavens were shut, and I was all shuddering and in grief. And I began to say in myself: 'If this sin is recorded against me, how shall I be saved? Or how shall I propitiate God for my completed sins? Or with what words shall I beseech the Lord to be forgiving unto me' (. . . πῶς ἐξιλάσομαι τὸν θεόν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου τῶν τελεσίων. . .).

In both instances God is in the accusative case, the object of the action. At least one competent scholar in each instance has rendered the verb into English with "propitiate," and it is felt the translation is correct. The Ninevites were certainly threatened with destruction by God, and the Shepherd of Hermas is pervaded by a fear as to what happens when a Christian sins after baptism.

---

And Dodd in The Johannine Epistles, p. lxix, dates the Johannine Epistles between A.D. 96 and 110.

<sup>1</sup>The English translation is taken from The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, newly translated and annotated by James A. Kleist (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946), p. 13, in Ancient Christian Writers, The Works of the Fathers in Translation, edited by Johannes Quasten and Joseph C. Plumpe, Number 1 (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946).

The Greek is cited from Büchsel, TWNT, III, 315, f.n. 67.

<sup>2</sup>Kirsopp Lake, "The Shepherd of Hermas," in The Apostolic Fathers with an English Translation, in Two Volumes, Vol. II (London: William Heineman, Ltd., 1913) in the LCL, pp. 10-11.

## d. Summation

Büchsel observes that in addition to the more common usage of "to make gracious," usages of "to absolve" and "to expiate" have become evident at least in Philo.<sup>1</sup> He feels that such broadening of usage took place in the cultic usage of the word. For the cultic ritual aimed at one and the same time, making God gracious, absolving the worshipper from guilt, and expiating his sin.<sup>2</sup> It is very significant that he remarks: "Freilich Belege dafür, dass die Verben vor der LXX die Bedeutung entschuldigen, sühnen gehabt hätten, gibt es nicht."<sup>3</sup> While an instance in Plato's Laws 862 is felt by some to be an exception to this statement, even after the Septuagint with the exception of the Men Tyrannus inscriptions, secular Greek for the most part adhered to the usage "make gracious."

In some passages in Philo, the verbs express the idea of expiation or absolution; still the predominant usage is that of "to make gracious," and indeed we have already seen that the verbs have this usage a number of times in the Septuagint.<sup>4</sup> Even by Christian writers, these verbs are still used with the sense of "to make gracious."

So it is concluded that such broadening of usage "to

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 316, lines 24-27.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 316, line 44 - p. 317, line 8. And the last sentence reads: "Das Wort erhielt so eine komplexe, aber schliesslich doch einheitliche Bedeutung."

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 317, lines 8-9. Büchsel elaborates in f.n. 75. See discussion above on pp. 163-165.

<sup>4</sup>See discussions of ἐλάσκεσθαι pp. 15-37. and ἐξελάσκειν p. 42 ff. in Chapter I.

pp. 15-37  
pp. 42-4

make gracious" to include "expiate" and "absolve" probably took place in the most part in the Septuagint or other religious writings of the Jews. However, "to make gracious" was not replaced by these other usages, but "expiate" and "absolve" became merely additional usages these verbs could have on occasion. Moreover, for the most part, not only in secular, but in Jewish writings and the works of the early Christian writers, these verbs continued to have the usage of only "to make gracious" or "to propitiate."

In all the literature examined, there is only one passage where God is seen to be the author of the propitiation and the actor in making propitiation for men. And this is in the post Septuagint Jewish writer, Philo.<sup>1</sup> But one such instance does exist.

#### 4. ἱλασμός

ἱλασμός, as in the intertestamental religious writings of the Jews,<sup>2</sup> does not appear frequently in secular Greek.<sup>3</sup> As opposed to usage in the Septuagint where God is never the object of ἱλασμός, but it is, on the other hand, the gift of God on occasion,<sup>4</sup> it represents in Greek

<sup>1</sup>See p. 169 for discussion of Philo's Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis II, III (Legum Allegoria), III, 174.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 108-110 for discussion. II Macc. 3:33 is the only instance.

<sup>3</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 317, f.n. 77: "Nach den Indices fehlt es bei den attischen Rednern, Sophokles, Thukydides, Epiktet, in den Fragmenten der Orphiker, Vorsekratiker, Älteren Stoiker."

<sup>4</sup>See pp. 48-53. See Büchsel, TWNT, III, 318, lines 1-7.



literature usually "die Handlung, in der man die Gottheit gnädig und die Sünde unwirksam macht."<sup>1</sup>

ἑλασμός appears in the Orphica Argonautica 39 with the genitive of the object, τῶν θεῶν,<sup>2</sup> and except for this work of uncertain date, it is found for the most part in the works of Plutarch and Philo, and it appears with θεῶν and with the usage of "propitiation" or "appeasement" in Plutarch's Fabius Maximus XVIII:

For the gods' delight is in honours paid them by the fortunate. However, all the rites which the augurs advocated for the propitiation of the gods (πρὸς ἑλασμοὺς θεῶν)<sup>3</sup> or to avert inauspicious omens, were duly performed.

The usage of the word is similar to this where it occurs in Camillus VII.<sup>4</sup>

However, in Solone XII, Plutarch uses ἑλασμοὺς in conjunction with καθαρμοὺς, and the word seems to have a usage not confined to "propitiation" but also including the

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 317, lines 20-21.

<sup>2</sup>TLNT, p. 301, lists this instance where ἑλασμός has the usage, "an appeasing, propitiating."

LSGL, p. 828, lists this instance as an illustration of the usage, "a means of appeasing." The Orphica Argonautica 554 is also cited as an illustrative instance.

However, LSGL, p. xxxi, does not date this body of literature, and TLNT, p. xiii, merely places a "?" in the A.D. column as to the date of the work.

<sup>3</sup>Bernadotte Perrin, Plutarch's Lives with an English Translation, in Ten Volumes, Vol. III (London: William Heinemann, 1916), in the LCL, Fabius Maximus, pp. 117-197. The English is cited from p. 171; the Greek is cited from p. 170.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., Vol. II (London: William Heinemann, 1914), in the LCL, Camillus, pp. 93-207. P. 113: "At a later time, when he had laid down his command, he referred the matter to the Senate, and the seers announced tokens in their sacrifices that the gods were angry, and must be propitiated with due offerings." P. 112: "... θεῶν μὲν ἐλασμοῦ καὶ χαριστηρίων δεομένην."

idea of "expiation" and "absolvement":

Most important of all, by sundry rites of propitiation and purification (ἐλασμός τισι καὶ καθαρμός), and by sacred foundations, he hallowed and consecrated the city, and brought it to be observant of justice and more easily inclined to unanimity.<sup>1</sup>

Büchsel sums up the usage of ἐλασμός in Philo thus:

Bei Philo bedeutet es meist: die Opfersühne Plant 61; Rer Div Her 179; Congr 89. 107, daneben Entsündigung als Werk Gottes am Menschen Leg All III 174; Poster C 48. Auch hier entspricht der Sprachgebrauch des Substantive dem des Verbums.<sup>2</sup>

However, it seems rather than meaning "expiatory offering," ἐλασμός means simply "atonement" in the term "Day of Atonement" in De Plantatione 61.<sup>3</sup>

A more important exception to Büchsel is taken in regard to ἐλασμός indicating "absolvement" which is a work of God

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., Vol. I (London: William Heinemann, 1914), in LCL, Solon, pp. 403-499. The English is cited from pp. 433 and 435; the Greek is cited from p. 432.

Note, however, that John and William Langhorne, in Plutarch's Lives of Illustrious Men translated from the Greek with notes critical and historical, and a life of Plutarch, in 2 vols., Vol. I (London: Chatto & Windus, 1903), p. 97, translate ἐλασμός with "expiation": "What is of still greater consequence, by expiations, lustrations, and the erecting of temples and shrines, he hallowed and purified the city, and made the people more observant of justice and more inclined to union."

Büchsel, TWNT, III, 317, lines 25-28, comments that the double meaning of ἐλάσκομαι "gnädig machen und entschuldigen bzw sühnen" here in Solon is also seen in the usage of ἐλασμός.

<sup>2</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 318, lines 8-11.

<sup>3</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo with an English Translation, in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes), Vol. III (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1954), in the LCL, pp. 207-305. P. 243: "An illustration of what has been said is afforded by that which is done year by year on the day called the 'Day of Atonement.'" P. 242: "... ἡμέρα τῇ λεγομένη τοῦ ἐλασμοῦ."

in De Posteritate Caini 48. A portion of section 48 reads:

The other form of being brought low results from the exercise of hardy strength, and this has for its sequel propitiation (*ἔλασμός*), determined by 10, the perfect number: for there is a command to bring low our souls on the tenth day of the month (Lev. xxiii. 27), and this signifies to put away boasting, a putting away which leads to an imploring of pardon for sins voluntary and involuntary.<sup>1</sup>

While *ἔλασμός* might have the usage of "expiation" instead of "propitiation," it is the result of man's activity rather than that of God. True, it is the result of "being brought low," but in section 46 Philo states, "We are brought low . . . when in our eager quest of virtue we check in ourselves the swelling of self-conceit."<sup>2</sup> Man, in the "checking," seems to be active and not passive.

Yet Büchsel is right that in Legum Allegoria III. 174, *ἔλασμός* indicates the absolvment or propitiation<sup>3</sup> that God provides for man.<sup>4</sup>

The conclusion is that though *ἔλασμός* does not appear very often in secular Greek, as in the Septuagint it is a rich or flexible term.<sup>5</sup> Thus it can designate that which

<sup>1</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo with an English Translation, Vol. II; The Posterity and Exile of Cain (De Posteritate Caini), pp. 321-437. The English is cited from pages 353 and 355; the Greek is cited from page 354.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 353.

<sup>3</sup>The exact word used to translate *ἔλασμός* is of secondary importance. The fact that there is no one and only translation is indicated by the fact that Colson and Whitaker, in Philo with an English Translation, I, 419, use "propitiation." TLNT, p. 301, list this instance to illustrate the usages, "the means of appeasing, a propitiation," and LSGL, p. 828, list it among examples where the usage is "atone-ment, sin-offering." It is interesting that all other instances of this usage cited by LSGL are taken from the LXX, Apocrypha, or New Testament.

<sup>4</sup>This passage has been quoted and discussed on pp. 169-170.

<sup>5</sup>See p. 53.



makes the god or gods gracious; it can have the usage simply of "atonement" as in the Day of Atonement; and it can indicate that which makes sin not counted against the sinner, whether this be termed "expiation" or "absolution." In one instance it designates the afflicting of the people by God, which is, if they could only perceive it, a means of absolution and reconciliation. In one instance in Philo man is passive and God is active. This shows that even in non-Biblical Greek ἔλασμός can on occasion approach the usage of "means of forgiveness," but such usage is very rare.

### 5. ἔλαστήριος and ἔλαστήριον

#### a. Early Usage

As in the case of the intertestamental literature, ἔλαστήριος and ἔλαστήριον can be conveniently considered together. For in several cases, scholars are by no means positive whether the Greek word in the text is an adjective or a noun.

Despite the detailed study of James Morison concluding that "There can thus be no doubt of the actual conventional usage of the word as employed adjectively,"<sup>1</sup> most scholars feel that the word usually appears as a substantive.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>James Morison, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

<sup>2</sup>See discussion, pp. 279-305 in Morrison.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3029, 3033.

The statement in Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 303, that Deissmann "comes to the conclusion that the word must be understood not as a term. techn. for כִּפָּרֶת or cover (of the ark of the covenant), but as an adj. = "of use for propitiation, . . ." can be misleading. He does reject the understanding of the word as a term. techn. for כִּפָּרֶת but while giving the term a general usage, he does not say

The one<sup>1</sup> instance in this body of literature that most clearly uses the word as an adjective is a "fragment of a philosophical work concerning the gods."<sup>2</sup> The fragment, No. 337 in Fayum Towns and Their Papyri, is by an unknown author. As Deissman observes, "The actual fragment dates from the second century A.D.; but the text itself may of course be older."<sup>3</sup>

The inscription reads: τοῖς θεοῖς εἰλαστη[ρίο]υς  
 θυσίας ἁξιω[θέ]ντες ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.<sup>4</sup> Aside from giving proof that the adjective does exist, it shows that the adjective does not necessarily have any implication of the  
 תָּרַחֵן. Moreover, since the word θυσίας follows the adjective, the implication is that εἰλαστηρίου of itself does not have the idea of sacrifice latent in its usage.<sup>5</sup>

The second instance to be examined is in Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews 16:182 (or 16:7:1) in the first

---

it is an adjective. Indeed in Deissmann's "ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟC und ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," which Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., refer to, Deissmann clearly states on p. 209 that Paul probably thought of the word as a substantive.

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3029, observes that the only other instance that definitely presents the word as an adjective is Cod. A of IV Macc. 17:22. For a discussion of 4 Macc. 17:22 see above pp. 121-127.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 303.

<sup>3</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3029.

<sup>4</sup>Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 303. And it is noted that as for the form εἰλαστηρίου, εἰλαστήριον in Rom. 3:25 B\*<sup>D</sup> should be compared.

The inscription originally appeared in Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur Surridge Hunt, and David George Hogarth, Fayum Towns and Their Papyri, with a chapter by J. G. Milne (London: Egypt Explor. Fund, 1900).

<sup>5</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3029.

century A.D.: τοῦ δέοντος ἐλαστήριον μνῆμα<sup>1</sup> The word occurs in the relating of how Herod attempted to rob the tomb of David. Two of his guards were killed by a flame that burst out upon those that entered, and Herod, terribly frightened, erected this propitiatory monument at the mouth of the sepulchre. ἑλαστήριον is probably an adjective also in this instance.<sup>2</sup> However, since it has been proven in the case of 4 Macc. 17:22 that both the adjectival and substantive forms exist, the importance of the citation does not depend on whether the word is an adjective or a noun.<sup>3</sup>

The importance rests on the fact that the word has no relation to the תְּרִפָּה , even though used by a Jew.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the ἐλαστήριον, if a noun, seems to have the usage of "means of propitiation" with no idea of "propitiatory sacrifice" being connected with the stone monument. And if the word is an adjective, the indication is even yet

<sup>1</sup>Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 320, line 16.

<sup>2</sup>So *TWNT*, III, 320; *LSGL*, p. 328, Bauer, *op. cit.*, col. 680; Morris, "The Meaning of ἐλαστήριον," p. 33; *TLNT*, p. 301; and also Cremer in *BTL*, p. 305. Deissmann, both in "Mercy Seat," col. 3030, and in "ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟC und ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 196, stands almost alone in considering ἐλαστήριον in this instance a substantive, and he admits the possibility of its being an adjective.

<sup>3</sup>For a similar observation on Rom. 3:25 see Deissmann, "ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟC und ΙΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 211.

<sup>4</sup>The comment and question of Büchsel in *TWNT*, III, 321, f.n. 13, is especially interesting in regard to the lack of relationship between the תְּרִפָּה and ἐλαστήριον in the mind of Josephus: "Josephus redet bei seiner Beschreibung der Bundeslade Ant 3, 134-138 nicht von ἐλαστήριον nur von einem ἐπίθεμα mit den Cherubim, Ant 3, 240-243 bei der Beschreibung der Versöhnungstages erwähnt er die Bundeslade überhaupt nicht; beschreibt er den zu seiner Zeit üblichen Brauch?"

d/  
d/



stronger than the usage is simply "propitiatory" with no thought of sacrifice attached to the word. Above all, *ἑλαστήριον* here designates the purpose and nature of the monument erected by Herod because of his great fear. It designates that which was intended to propitiate and appease the supernatural power that killed two of the grave robbers and terrified Herod. Man is the doer, taking the initiative in the erection of the statue, and a supernatural power, either God or the dead,<sup>1</sup> is the object.

A third instance of *ἑλαστήριον* in which it is probably a substantive<sup>2</sup> appears in the *Orationes* xi, of Dio Chrysostom, who lived between about 40 A.D. and 120 A.D. As Morison observes: "The Trojans were for insisting that the Greeks should make some atonement (*δίκην τινὰ ἐποσχεῖν*) for having causelessly waged war."<sup>3</sup> Ulysses pledges that the Greeks would leave behind them a monument to Minerva:

καταλείψειν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἀνάθημα κάλλιστον καὶ μέγιστον τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ ἐπιγράψειν· ἑλαστήριον Ἀχαιῶν τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Ἰλιάδι.<sup>4</sup> In such a brief inscription, it seems more natural for *ἑλαστήριον* to be a sub-

<sup>1</sup>See Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 320, f.n. 10.

<sup>2</sup>So considered by Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 321, lines 2-7; Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3030; Deissmann, "ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟC und ἸΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 195; *TLNT*, p. 301; Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 154; Bauer, *op. cit.*, col. 680; and Cremer in *BTL*, p. 305. Morison, *op. cit.*, pp. 295-298, gives detailed study to this instance but stands almost alone in maintaining *ἑλαστήριον* is an adjective.

<sup>3</sup>James Morison, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

<sup>4</sup>Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

stantive than an adjective. Certainly there is no thought of the  $\text{תָּרַם}$ , nor does the word have the idea of sacrifice,<sup>1</sup> though it might be considered a votive gift.<sup>2</sup> The story behind the monument makes it clear, however, that its purpose was to propitiate, if not Minerva, the Trojans.<sup>3</sup>

ἱλαστήριον appears two more times as a neuter substantive with the usage of votive gift or oblation in a way similar to that in Dio Chrysostom<sup>4</sup> in inscriptions 81 and 347 in The Inscriptions of Cos.<sup>5</sup>

The first, Cos 81, is found on a votive-gift which the people of Cos erected as a ἱλαστήριον for the welfare of the Emperor Augustus--ὁ δᾶμος ὑπὲρ (τ)ᾶς Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος, θεοῦ υἱοῦ, Σεβαστοῦ σωτηρίας θεοῦ ἱλαστήριον.

The second, Cos 347, which also belongs to the Imperial period, runs--ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ἀλεντίων Σε]βασ[τ]ῶ Διὶ Σ[τ]ρατίῳ ἱλαστήριον, δαμαρχεῦντος Γαίου Νωρβανοῦ Μοσχίωνος [φί]λοκαίσαρος

ἱλαστήριον appears in the four following instances in the writings of Philo:

On Flight and Finding, XIX: ". . . the lid of the ark, which he calls the Mercy-seat," with the Greek reading: ". . . τὸ ἐπίθημα τῆς κιβωτοῦ--καλεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ ἱλαστήριον, . . ." <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>BTL, p. 305; TLNT, p. 301; James Morison, op. cit., p. 298.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον," p. 34; Deissmann, "ἱΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟC und ἱΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 195.

<sup>3</sup>Morison, op. cit., p. 298, sees a possible reference to the wooden horse. Even if this were so, the ostensible purpose was placation, whatever the ulterior motive might have been.

<sup>4</sup>These instances are grouped together in Morris, "The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον," p. 34; Deissmann, "ἱΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟC und ἱΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 195; Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3030; Büchsel, TWNT, III, 321, and others.

<sup>5</sup>Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 303.

See also W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, The Inscriptions of Cos (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1891).

<sup>6</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo with an English Translation, Vol. V. The English is cited from p. 65; the Greek is cited from p. 64.

m/ On the Cherubim, and the Flaming Sword, and Cain the first Man created out of Man. VIII: ". . . For we read that the Cherubim stand face to face with their 'wings inclining to the mercy-seat' (Exod. xxv. 19)." And the Greek reads:

"καὶ γὰρ ἀντιπρόσωπά φησιν εἶναι νεύοντα πρὸς τὰ ἑλαστήριον πτεροῦς (Exod. xxv. 19)."

Moses II, 95 and 97: ". . . It was coated with costly gilding within and without, and was covered by a sort of lid, which is called in the sacred books the mercy-seat. . . . But the cover, which is called the mercy-seat, serves to support the two winged creatures which in the Hebrew are called cherubim. . . ." And the Greek reads: "

κεχυρωμένη πολυτελῶς ἐνδοθεν τε καὶ ἔξωθεν, ἥ τ' ἐπίθεμα ὡσανεὶ πῶμα τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἑλαστήριον --- τὸ δ' ἐπίθεμα τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἑλαστήριον βάσις ἐστὶ πτηνῶν δυνού, ἃ πατρίῳ μὲν γλώττῃ προσαγορεύεται Χερουβίμ, . . ."

Colson and Whitaker consistently translate ἑλαστήριον with mercy-seat, and indeed it does refer to the 𐤅𐤓𐤕𐤕 in every instance. Yet Deismann has a point in contending that in these passages ἑλαστήριον should be translated "propitiatory thing," since "In every case it is only the connection that shows the 'propitiatory thing' associated with the ark to be intended."<sup>3</sup>

Leon Morris rightly observes:

It is sometimes said that Philo uses the term to denote the 𐤅𐤓𐤕𐤕 but this does not quite describe the situation. Several times he calls the 𐤅𐤓𐤕𐤕 by some such name as ἐπίθεμα, or πῶμα and proceeds to explain that it is called ἑλαστήριον in the Scripture. While he could hardly expect the Greek public for which he wrote to have a detailed knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, and thus his

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., Vol. II. The English is cited from pp. 23 and 25; the Greek is cited from pp. 22 and 24.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., Vol. VI. The English is cited from p. 297; the Greek is cited from p. 296.

<sup>3</sup>Deismann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3032.



explanations should not be held to prove too much, yet they show that the general public of his day had a clear idea of what *ἑλαστήριον* meant, and this idea was not the *תְּרִבּוּ*.<sup>1</sup>

In summation regarding these nine instances of either the adjective or noun in early non-Biblical Greek the following observations are made:

1. It is probably an adjective two times with the general usage of propitiatory.

a. The fact that it modifies *θυσίας* in the Fayum Town inscription would indicate *ἑλαστήριος* of itself did not include the idea of sacrifice.

b. Josephus uses it to describe a monument built by a man to propitiate either God or the dead. When Josephus does speak of the *תְּרִבּוּ*, he never uses *ἑλαστήριον*.

2. It is probably a substantive with Dio Chrysostom and in the two inscriptions of Cos. Men, either the Greeks or the people of Cos, erect the *ἑλαστήριον* in all three instances. *ἑλαστήριον* in each instance could have the usage of "votive gift" or simply "means or instrument of propitiation."

3. Philo uses the term as a technical term for the *תְּרִבּוּ*, but he is keenly aware that *ἑλαστήριον* would ordinarily mean something quite different to his readers.

---

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἑλαστήριον*," p. 40. Büchsel, in *TWNT*, III, 320, lines 39-43, makes a very similar observation.

## b. Later Usage

After the time of the apostles, "the Greek Fathers from Origen onwards seem usually to take *ἐλασθήριον* in the sense of mercy-seat."<sup>1</sup> This is impressive but not decisive,<sup>2</sup> more especially when it is seen that later writers use *ἐλασθήριον* both as an adjective and as a noun that signifies several things other than the *תְּכֵיטֵת*.

A form of *ἐλασθήριος*—*ἐλασθήριον* appears both in the *Dionysiaca*, XIII, of Nonnus (4th-5th century A.D.)<sup>3</sup> and also in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 1985, 11 (6th century A.D.)<sup>4</sup> but the meaning is uncertain in both instances and is of little help.

The only instance of the adjective in later writings is from Nicephorus in "Vita Symeon. Stylit.," in *Acta Sanctorum Maii*, V. 335:17: "*χεῖρας ἐκετηρίους, εἰ βούλει δὲ ἐλαστηρίους, ἐκτείνας θεῷ*," where it has the usage of

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλασθήριον*," p. 38. For additional evidence and discussion on this point see James Morison, *op. cit.*, p. 288, and also Gifford, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλασθήριον*," p. 38, mentions that "the Fathers who mention the term were separated by centuries from the Apostle." Dodd, in *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 60, also presents a criticism, though of another nature, of the classical theologians from Origen onwards as regards their exegesis of *ἐλασθήριον*.

<sup>3</sup>The author seems to use the word to describe a certain locality. The text and various conjectures are discussed in Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3031, and James Morison, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

<sup>4</sup>B. P. Grenfell, and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London, 1898-1927), 1985.11.

LSGL, p. 2078, list the instance under *ἐλασθήριος*, noting that the sense is dubious.

Bauer, *op. cit.*, col. 680, apparently considers it a substantive but notes: "Unsicher ist die Bedeutung."

"propitiatory."<sup>1</sup>

Deissmann reports that "Sabas in the Typicum (Venice ed.), chaps. 1 and 5, gives the name of *ἐλαστήριον* to the place of the altar, the choir (bema, cancellis inclusum), e.g., (Chap. 5). *θυμιᾷ τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν σταυροειδῶς ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ἐλαστήριον ἅπαν.*"<sup>2</sup>

While "the place of the altar"<sup>3</sup> certainly emphasizes the locative aspect of *ἐλαστήριον*, it does not point to either "propitiatory sacrifice" or "תְּחִינָה" as a usage of *ἐλαστήριον*. Moreover, while "the place of the altar" may be an admissible translation of *ἐλαστήριον* in this instance, it is surely not the only admissible translation, nor necessarily the best.

Deissmann, in "ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ und ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 198, under 8, seems to refer to this instance of Sabas where he indicates usages of the word such as the altar fence and the altar room.

As we shall see from Johannes Kameniates, if an entire church could be regarded as a votive gift, a means of propitiation, much more should the room of the altar, the central

---

<sup>1</sup>So reported in Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3030. Simon Stylites lived 320-459. And according to TLNT, p. 301, Nicophorus died 828 A.D.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3031. In f.n. 9 Deissmann notes that whether Sabas, who died in 531 A.D., is the author or not is questionable. However, it is clear that someone used *ἐλαστήριον* in such a manner. See also Deissmann, "ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ und ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," p. 196.

<sup>3</sup>*Ἐλαστήριον* is so translated by Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3031, and again in col. 3033. Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," seems to concur in this translation.



area of worship, be regarded in addition to "the place of the altar," also "the means of propitiation."

While Deissmann does not make the suitability of the instrumental usage of *ἑλαστήριον* in this instance clear while he is discussing it, his concluding statement after a consideration of these late instances of *ἑλαστήριον* does make it clear:

... τὸ *ἑλαστήριον* signifies "the propitiatory thing," "the means of propitiation." What the propitiatory thing that is actually intended may be has to be determined in each case by the context.<sup>1</sup>

Deissmann also reports two instances where *ἑλαστήριον* indicates "altar":

Hesychius, the lexicographer, explains *ἑλαστήριον* as *καθάρσιον, θυσιαστήριον*, i.e., he gives a synonym ("that which purifies" and "that which propitiates" are nearly related ideas) and adds a special meaning which, of course, is possible only in a particular context, that of "altar," which Cyril, the lexicographer cited by Schleusner, explains quite rightly when he says: *ἑλαστήριον. θυσιαστήριον, ἐν ᾧ προσφέρει (προσφερεται?) περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*<sup>2</sup>

T. W. Manson, who sees the idea of place and locality in *ἑλαστήριον*, observes: "The lexicographers Hesychius and Cyril treat *ἑλαστήριον* and *θυσιαστήριον* as practically interchangeable terms, . . ."<sup>3</sup> However, it is believed that Morris offers a superior argument in favor of the instrumental usage of *ἑλαστήριον* when he writes:

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3032.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3031. *LSGL*, p. xxvi, indicates that Hesychius probably lived in the fifth century A.D. though there is doubt. *LSGL*, p. 851, also indicates one of the usages of *καθάρσιος* is "expiation."

<sup>3</sup>T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

There may be a hint of location here (referring to *ἐλαστήριον* in Ezekiel), but in such an expression as 'place of atonement' it is atonement rather than place to which this word directs our attention. It is along these lines that we must understand the references in the lexicographers Hesychius and Cyril. Manson's statement that the two treat *ἐλαστήριον* and *θυσιαστήριον* 'as practically interchangeable terms' seems a little too definite. Hesychius defines *ἐλαστήριον* as '*καθάρσιον, θυσιαστήριον*' which appears to mean that the explanation he prefers is *καθάρσιον*, *θυσιαστήριον* being a meaning the word can have on occasion. In his footnote to Hesychius Joannes Alberti cites Cyril's explanation . . . . It is not that *ἐλαστήριον* and *θυσιαστήριον* in themselves are of similar meaning, but that aspect of the latter in which it appears as cleansing from sins, brings it into the circle of meaning of the former. It is the altar in its propitiatory aspect which may be denoted by *ἐλαστήριον*.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, Deissmann records two instances where

*ἐλαστήριον* refers to a monastery:

Menander the historian (6th-7th Cent. A.D.) in *Excerpt. Hist.* 352:12 f. alludes to *τὸν μοναστήριον οἶκον τὸν λεγόμενον Σεβανόν* and afterwards (16) designates this monastery as a *ἐλαστήριον* (*τείχει τε κατησφαλισμένων τὸ ἐλαστήριον*<sup>2</sup>)--a designation which might on occasion be quite appropriate.

In Joseph Genesios (10th cent. A.D.) 103:21 a monastery is called *ἐλαστήριον*, just as in Menander: *ὥς δὲ παρεστήκει τοῖς τοῦ ἐλαστηρίου προθέροις*.<sup>3</sup>

Deissmann, noting still greater variety among the references to *ἐλαστήριον*, records: "Theophanes Continuatus (10th cent. A.D.) in two places (326:21 f. and 452:14) calls a church *ἐλαστήριον*."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," p. 37. Morison, in *op. cit.*, pp. 301-320, discusses these instances, maintaining mainly that *ἐλαστήριον* cannot mean "propitiatory sacrifice" in these instances.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3031. See also Deissmann, "*ἱλαστήριος* und *ἱλαστήριον*," p. 197.

<sup>3</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3031. See also Deissmann, "*ἱλαστήριος* und *ἱλαστήριον*," p. 197.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*

T. W. Manson has observed that "Monasteries, churches, sanctuaries---all these are most naturally thought of as places where man may seek and find the grace and mercy of God."<sup>1</sup> While such a locative usage of *ἐλαστήριον* may seem natural, Johannes Kameniates, who was writing in the tenth century A.D., the same century that Joseph Genesios and Theophanes Continuatus were referring to a monastery and a church as *ἐλαστήριον*, gives a different explanation as to why they were called *ἐλαστήριον*, and he stresses the instrumental nature of the term. Deissmann presents the evidence of Johannes Kameniates with an important application of it to these preceding instances as follows:

How this use of the word is to be explained can be well seen in a passage of Johannes Kameniates (10th cent. A.D.), who says of sumptuous ecclesiastical buildings (502:10 f.) that they are 'as it were propitiatory gifts dedicated by the community to the deity' (*ὡς περ τινὰ κοινὰ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἐλαστήρια*). Here *ἐλαστήριον* has its old meaning 'propitiatory thing,' more particularly 'propitiatory gift.' If it was possible with Johannes Kameniates to liken a church to a *ἐλαστήριον*, it was also possible even to call a church or a cloister by that name, as Theophanes Continuatus, Joseph Genesios, and Menander actually do.<sup>2</sup>

In summation of the later usage of *ἐλαστήριος-ἐλαστήριον*, the word appears as an adjective once, with Nicephorus, where it has the usage of "propitiatory."

As a substantive, it is used to designate:

1. The *ἱερόν* (Origen and other Fathers).

<sup>1</sup>T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," cols. 3031-3032. A similar application of this instance of *ἐλαστήριον* is made by Morris in "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," pp. 36-37.



2. The place or room of the altar (Sabas).
3. The Altar (Hesychius and Cyril).
4. A monastery (Menander and Joseph Genesios).
5. A Church (Theophanes Continuatus).
6. A votive offering or a propitiatory gift (Johannes Kameniates).

All six of these things refer to an object; the first five could refer also to a place, but they could also be viewed as "instrument of propitiation" or "means of propitiation." And in the sixth instance, not only does *ἱλαστήριον* demand to be rendered in some such way, but the same instance also shows that these propitiatory gifts or instruments consist of sumptuous ecclesiastical buildings. Consequently, a church, a monastery, or an article within or a part of such an ecclesiastical building can certainly be so considered also. And some such usage as "means of propitiation" is applicable to all six instances; "place of propitiation" is applicable to only some of the instances, and the same can be said of "תְּנֻנָּה"; while "propitiatory sacrifice" is applicable to none.

### C. Conclusions

In the ancient Greek religion, the various gods were frequently imagined to be angry with men, sometimes for no obvious reason. Consequently, propitiatory rites were not uncommon, and in these rites, man was the doer and initiator, while the god or gods concerned were the objects.

Lexicons define various members of the *ελάσκεσθαι*

group of words with such terms as "propitiation," "atonement," "propitiatory" occurring again and again, with an occasional variation, such as "appeasable," "placable," or "ransom."

Even with one of the more remote members of the *ελάσκεσθαι* group, such as *ἐλεως*, it is noticed that while *ἐλεως* is always a predicate of God in the Septuagint, it appears in Plato in the construction *ἐλεω πολεον* with the gods as the object.

In regard to the verbs *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* and *ελάσκεσθαι* while there may be overtones of "worship" in their usage, the basic usage is "to make gracious" and on occasion when man is the object, "to bribe." Even with Plato, the verb is probably used with the idea of "propitiate" or "conciliate" rather than "expiate," though with the Men Tyrannus inscriptions, the verb appears with not the god, but with the thing for which propitiation or expiation is being made as its object. Even in such instances, the probability is that the sin is being expiated in order to enjoy a more propitious relationship with God.

With Jewish writers, Josephus has Saul vowing to propitiate God, and even urges Jerusalem to try to propitiate God. Philo uses the verb in several instances, including a passage where man propitiates God, but in one important passage God is the author of the propitiation he provides for men.

In two early Christian writings, the verb again appears with man or men as the subject and God as the object.

The verb never appears to have the usage of "forgive,"

which in a few instances, even though accompanied by overtones of avoiding wrath, it did have in the Septuagint.

ἱλασμός appears with the genitive of the object, τῶν θεῶν in the Orphica Argonautica. It also appears with the usage of "propitiation" or "appeasement" in Plutarch though on occasion it can also have the usage of "absolvement" or "expiation." With Philo it is used in several ways, and in one instance it represents the absolvment or means of forgiveness that God provides for man.

ἱλαστήριος and ἱλαστήριον both appear in Greek other than the Bible or the intertestamental writings of the Jews.

The adjective appears once modifying θυσίας, from which it is concluded that the adjective and the noun do not of themselves contain the idea of "sacrifice."

Josephus uses the term, probably as an adjective, to describe a monument erected by a man, prompted by fear, to appease either God or the dead. It is interesting that when Josephus does discuss the כִּפֹּרֶת, he never uses ἱλαστήριον. The term again appears with the apparent usage of "instrument of propitiation" in Dio Chrysostom and among the inscriptions of Cos. With Philo, it always designates the כִּפֹּרֶת, but either by reference to the cherubim or by an explanatory statement that makes clear that the ἱλαστήριον is the lid or cover of the ark, he indicates that he felt his readers might interpret ἱλαστήριον as "instrument of propitiation" in great generality. And he



always arranges the context so that it is clear as to what particular instrument of propitiation he intends *ἐλαστήριον* to indicate.

In later times *ἐλαστήριον* indicates the *תָּרִיבֵּן*, the place of the altar, the altar, a monastery, a church, and a propitiatory gift or votive offering. Not all of these things can be considered propitiatory sacrifices, the *תָּרִיבֵּן* or even "a place of propitiation," but they can all be considered "an instrument of propitiation" or "a means of propitiation." Thus, the later usage of the word tends to reinforce the general nature of its meaning detected in the inscriptions, papyri, Josephus, Philo, and Dio Chrysostom.

As in earlier usage it indicates a means of propitiation made by man, so also in a tenth century instance *ἐλαστήρια* indicates ecclesiastical buildings dedicated by the community to the deity.

## Chapter V

### NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE

#### A. Hebraic and Hellenistic Views Compared

Before studying the Pauline and Johannine doctrines of propitiation, let us set down what has been determined as the Hebraic and the Hellenistic doctrines of propitiation, especially as expressed by the *ἐλάσσεσθαι* group of words in Greek and the *כַּפַּר* group in Hebrew. This is necessary if we are to be able to speak of the Hebrew or the Hellenistic elements. Yet there are two points to keep in mind. First, there is some common ground in the two doctrines and they are not on every score opposed to one another and entirely different. Second, not every Hebrew writer adheres to or voices the same doctrine of propitiation, and the same may be said of Greek thinkers. What is termed the Hebraic or the Hellenistic doctrine of propitiation is that which investigation in the earlier chapters has indicated is the predominant view, not necessarily the exclusive view or the view that is without contradictions or exceptions.

##### 1. Hebraic Doctrine

The predominant Hebrew doctrine is that the Deity is a holy and righteous God. His reaction to sin is wrath. This wrath is real and personal, but hardly ever manifested except as a result of sin. God is also merciful, gracious, and loyal to his covenant. God can be propitiated on occasion

by sincere prayer (Ex. 32:30), and the same family of words, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek versions of the Old Testament, sometimes have more the usage of "forgive" than "be propitiated." Yet, when God graciously forgives, his forgiveness is felt to be an alternative to destruction and other manifestations of his wrath. For the most part,  $\text{כִּסֹּף}$  and  $\text{ἐλάσσεσθαι}$  words are used in relation to various sacrifices and cultic practices that have the general function of making atonement between the sinner and God, i.e., helping to effect a reconciliation and restoring the sinner into the full fellowship of the covenant community. Sometimes these sacrifices serve to cleanse from sin, but the object is the sinner, not the sin. The concern is more with personal relationships, i.e., that of the sinner and God, than that of a mechanical cleansing from sin. The act of propitiation involves the removal of sin; God is Holy. Indeed, two of the limitations of the sacrificial system are: (1) it offers no hope for deliberate, premeditated, high-handed sins; and (2) usually the benefits of the sacrificial system are limited to the people of the covenant.

Yet within the covenant, the idea of vicarious sacrifice is applied in such a way that the life of the animal is taken rather than that of the sinner. God's holiness is vindicated; his righteousness is upheld; yet his graciousness is manifested and his saving love towards the people of the covenant is demonstrated. The sacrifice sets forth the seriousness of sin in the eyes of God and yet his love for the people and



his loyalty to the covenant.

A significant point to note is that the procedure is viewed as the gracious gift of God. It is the method devised by God. It is viewed as being given by Moses and Aaron and others at the command of God. He is the initiator of this method by which the people may be reconciled after sinning and by which they may not feel his wrath. The sacrificial system is the gift of God, not the invention of man. Yet, even after unwitting sins, the means of atonement God offers in the sacrificial system must be employed or the sinner will feel the wrath of God. In such circumstances, the rite is not propitiation in the sense the sinner appeases the wrath of God with rituals devised by men. Yet the rite prevents the wrath of God from falling on the sinner, when the sinner, by availing himself of the divinely ordained means, does what is required for him to be reconciled into the covenant community and its relation to God.

## 2. Hellenistic Doctrine

The Hellenistic idea in some ways should be more varied than the Hebraic since not only were there several gods to be dealt with instead of one, but there was a wide variety of religions. Yet the general view is clear at several points. The gods were viewed as not being too friendly towards men. They were easy to provoke, and sometimes they would give manifestations of their wrath not only because of sin, but because of jealousy in regard to a human being's property, or for no apparent reason. Far from being holy, the morality

of the gods was on a lower level than that of some people.

Under such conditions, the people attempted to propitiate the gods in various ways, though in general there was no sure promise that any rite would atone for a sin. Moreover, the propitiation was carried out with man as the initiator and the god as the object. Even though Plato rejected various rites that served to propitiate the deity by "the purchase of indulgences," the method he suggested, i.e., man's ceasing to do evil and learning to do well, still puts the matter wholly on what man learns and does.

In regard to the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group of words, "worship," "expiate," and "conciliate" can be the more likely of *ἐλάσκεσθαι* usages on occasion, but "to make gracious" predominates. Of the Jewish Hellenistic authors, Strabo, Josephus, and Philo, all use the verb with the idea of people's propitiating God or a god, though Philo also uses the verb once with God as the subject. The verb also appears in non-canonical Christian writings with man or men as the subject and God as the object.

*ἑλάσμός* appears with varied usages: "propitiation," "appeasement," "absolvement," or "expiation," and in one instance with Philo it represents the means of forgiveness presented by God.

*ἑλαστήριον* appears both as adjective and as noun. As an adjective, "propitiatory" is the usage. The noun is used to designate a wide variety of objects including the *תְּרִיבָה*. The usage "a means of propitiation" or "an

instrument of propitiation" fits all cases better than any other. When used as a noun, by others than Philo, and in reference to a god or gods, it indicates a means or instrument of propitiation effected by men on behalf of men with the god or gods as the object.

### 3. A Comparison of Hebraic and Hellenistic Doctrines

The major similarity in the two types of propitiation is that in both cases one of the results, if not the chief result, is that the worshipper shall not feel the wrath of God, but a more propitious manifestation of divine power.

The major difference is that in Hebraic thought, as a rule, there is more of the element of free forgiveness. In regard to the sacrificial system, God is the initiator in that he has graciously provided the method of propitiation. In Hellenistic thought, man is the initiator, the doer, and a god or the gods the object of the action.

In both Hebraic and Hellenistic thought divine wrath is considered real.<sup>1</sup> But in Hebraic thought, God's wrath was his holy reaction to sin; in Hellenistic thought, the gods were less holy and more capricious with the manifestations of their wrath.

When sacrifices were offered, in Hellenistic thought one

---

<sup>1</sup>This is the predominant feeling in both Hebraic and Hellenistic thought. Certain exceptions to this idea in some Greek philosophy are indicated by Morris, "The Wrath of God," p. 144: "The idea that God cannot be angry is by no means a new one, but it is not Biblical, and as Edwyn Bevan has pointed out, it seems to have come into Christianity from the Greek philosophic view."



was never sure that even then the gods had been propitiated. In Hebraic thought, provided the ritual was followed by a Hebrew for a sin not committed with a high hand, assurance was given the believer that his sin was covered and that he was restored into the full covenant relationship with God. Whether the Hebrew accepted it or not was a matter of his faith in the promises of Scripture. However, for non-Jews or for some sins, the sacrificial system as set forth in the Old Testament also failed to offer any way of being reconciled to God.

## B. Pauline Doctrine

### 1. Introduction

While the death of Christ is central for Paul,<sup>1</sup> while Paul sees Christ as God's instrument of reconciliation,<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>I Cor. 1:23; I Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:3-4.

Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Hendrick Grobel, 2 vols. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., Vol. I, 1952, and Vol. II, 1955), I, 296: "The propitiatory idea is also behind the passages in which Jesus is described as he who died 'for our sins' (I Cor. 15:3; II Cor. 5:14) or simply died 'for us' (Rom. 5:6, 8; 14:15; I Thess. 5:10; cf. I Cor. 1:13), or he who was 'given up' or 'gave himself up' for us" (Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Gal. 1:4; 2:20)."

And pressing the relationship between *ὑπέρ* and *ἀντί* Bultmann relates substitution to propitiation: "Closely related to the idea of propitiatory sacrifice is that of vicarious sacrifice, which likewise has its origin in the field of cultic-juristic thinking (#7, 3). The same phrase (*ὑπέρ ἡμῶν*) that is translated 'for us' can also express this idea, meaning now: 'instead of us,' 'in place of us.' Thus: Gal. 3:13, 'becoming a curse in our stead' (tr. cf. Goodspeed); II Cor. 5:21: 'he made him who was unacquainted with sin to be sin in our stead' (tr. 29, 2) . . ."

<sup>2</sup>Rom. 5:10; II Cor. 4:19-20; Eph. 2:16; Col. 1:19-21. As to the exact nature of the "reconciliation," scholars are not agreed. James Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," pp. 555-725 in The Expositor's Greek Testament, 5 vols., edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, Vol. II (London: Hodder and

while Paul holds that man has peace with God through Christ,<sup>1</sup>  
 while Paul speaks of our redemption through Christ,<sup>2</sup> and

Stoughton, 1900), p. 626, relates Rom. 5:10 with propitiation and stresses the fact that the result is a change in God's attitude towards us: "Nothing could show more unmistakably that the *καταλλαγή* is not a change in our disposition toward God, but a change in His attitude toward us. We do not give it (by laying aside enmity, distrust, or fear); we receive it, by believing in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood."

James S. Stewart, in A Man in Christ, The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1951), maintains the opposite of this view on pp. 204 ff. This statement on p. 214 represents his view: "Ours, say the apostle, is the enmity; and therefore ours--not God's--the need to be reconciled."

Friedrich Büchsel in his discussion of *καταλλάσσω* in TWNT, Vol. I, also takes the position maintained by Stewart. See especially TWNT, I, 255, lines 11-21.

The most likely view regards the reconciliation as in some sense mutual. Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 129-130; their position is best stated in their own words, p. 130: "We infer that the natural explanation of the passages which speak of enmity and reconciliation between God and man is that they are not on one side only, but are mutual."

And more recently this position of mutual reconciliation, while at the same time recognizing the initiative of God in the reconciliation, has been lucidly set forth by John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," pp. 355-668 in the IB, Vol. IX. See especially pp. 459-462.

<sup>1</sup>Rom. 5:1; Col. 1:20; Eph. 2:11-22.

<sup>2</sup>Rom. 3:24 (this will be discussed again in relation to Rom. 3:25); I Cor. 1:30; Eph. 1:7; 1:14; Col. 1:14, all of which contain *ἀπολύτρωσις*.

Adolf Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, The New Testament, illustrated by recently discovered texts of the Graeco-Roman World, translated by R. M. Strachan (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), pp. 322-334, gives an excellent study of how *ἀπολύτρωσις* was related in Hellenistic Greek with the manumission of slaves.

Büchsel, in TWNT, IV, 354-359, disparages any idea of price, purchase, or ransom (*λύτρου*) in the term.

However, in view of Acts 20:28; I Cor. 6:20 ("You were bought with a price"); I Cor. 7:23 ("You were bought with a price"); Gal. 3:13, it is hard to escape the idea of cost and ransom. This view also appears in non-Pauline or doubtful Pauline literature in I Pet. 1:18; Rev. 5:9; I Tim. 2:6. This would not necessarily mean that Paul, Peter, and John were all dependent upon Hellenistic thought. It is much more probable they were dependent upon the words of Christ in



while the cumulative weight of all these instances is considerable, the classical and determinative passage regarding the Pauline doctrine of propitiation is Rom. 3:19-31, especially verse 25, which contains the only instance of "propitiation" in the Pauline literature in the Authorized Version of the Bible, the only instance of a *ἐλάσκεισθαι* word in Pauline literature, and one of the two instances of *ἐλαστήριον* in the New Testament. James Denney has said, "Hence to comprehend *ἐλαστήριον* or propitiation as he (Paul) comprehended it, is to have the only key to his gospel."<sup>1</sup>

---

Mark 10:45 (and a parallel passage in Matt. 20:28): "For the Son of Man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many (*καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*)."

<sup>1</sup>James Denney, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917), p. 152.

Moreover, Denney does not stand alone in stressing the importance of this verse.

F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, translated by A. Cusin, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880), p. 252, commenting on Rom. 3:25-26, says: "It is not without reason that these two verses have been called 'the marrow of theology.' Calvin declares 'that there is not probably in the whole Bible a passage which sets forth more profoundly the righteousness of God in Christ.' And yet it is so short that the statement seems scarcely to have begun when all is said; within so few lines are the more decisive thoughts concentrated! It is really, as Vitrings has said, 'the brief summary of divine wisdom.'"

James Morison, in A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, also observes regarding Rom. 3:25-26, on p. 269: "The two verses, in conjunction with the four which precede, are among the most important in the Bible." Morison, on pp. 269-272, also quotes statements and notations from Luther, Calvin, Mattias, Melancthon, Mussus, John Jacob Stolz, E. J. Grieve, Dr. Chalmers, C. P. Shepherd, Kolding, Stein, Philippi, Seb. Schmidt, Tischendorf, Bitrings, Vinke, and Cowper which testify to the central importance of this passage of Scripture for an understanding of Paul and the Christian faith.

More recently John Knox, in "The Epistle to the Romans,



## 2. Romans 3:21 ff.

While *ἐλαστήριο* is the key to the understanding of the Pauline conception of propitiation, it is well to approach this word by studying the context in which it is set and other important ideas which are related to it.

a. *Δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, and δικαιόω*

These words that indicate "righteous," "righteousness," and "justify" are tremendously important for the proper understanding not only of the Pauline doctrine of stonement, but of Paul himself.<sup>1</sup> It is no accident that Frederick Brooke Westcott could begin the title of his commentary on Romans and Galatians St. Paul and Justification.<sup>2</sup> Adolf Schlatter in a like manner has sensed the importance of the righteousness of God for Paul when he begins the title of his commentary on Romans with Gottes Gerechtigkeit.<sup>3</sup>

*Δικαιόω* in non-Biblical Greek had the usage of "deem

---

Introduction and Exegesis," in IB, IX, 431, has termed Rom. 3:24b-26 "one of the most difficult, as it is one of the most important, passages in the letter."

<sup>1</sup>Gottfried Quell and Gottlob Schrank, TWNT, II, 176-229, have made an excellent study of *δίκη* and its cognates. The title of the English translation of the study is Righteousness.

Other important studies are those of Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 42-59; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 28-31; Vincent Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, pp. 40-44.

Most commentaries and also Vincent Taylor in "Great Texts Reconsidered," pp. 295-300, in The Expository Times, Vol. I, Oct. 1938-Sept. 1939 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark), treat the concept and words in this section of Romans.

<sup>2</sup>Frederick Brooke Westcott, St. Paul and Justification, being an exposition of the teaching in the Epistles to Rome and Galatia (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1913).

<sup>3</sup>A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief. 2. Auflage (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1952).

right" or "do a man justice."<sup>1</sup> C. H. Dodd has made a contribution in \_\_\_\_\_ showing how *δικαίω* and its cognates had a richer usage for Paul that included "to vindicate" because of Paul's knowledge of the Hebrew *PTZ* that was often rendered but not exclusively rendered by forms of *δικαίω* in the Septuagint.<sup>2</sup>

Schrenk has also noted a dynamic as well as a static usage of the word in Paul:

God's righteousness is more than an attribute, in the static sense of Hellenistic ethics, or as in the older Protestant theology. It is dynamic--as active as his wrath (Rom. 1, 17 f.; iii, 5, 21, 25 f.) . . .

God both is and imparts righteousness. Paul's formula means that God is just, righteousness belongs to him; not however, in the sense of a mere attribute, but as something actually put forth in the showing of his judgement (Rom. iii, 25 f.).<sup>3</sup>

God is both just and the justifier.<sup>4</sup> The way he has acted to show both his personal righteousness and his desire

<sup>1</sup>LSCG, p. 429. A usage, "pronounce and treat as righteous, justify vindicate," is given but all references are to the LXX or NT.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 42-59. (See especially pp. 57-59. On p. 57 he states, referring to Paul, "The apostle wrote Greek, and read the LXX, but he was also familiar with the Hebrew original. Thus while his language follows that of the LXX, the Greek words are for him always coloured by their Hebrew association.")

<sup>3</sup>Schrenk, in Quell and Schrenk, *Righteousness*, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-44.

John Knox, in "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," IV, IX, 428, notes three meanings of "the righteousness of God" present in Rom. 3:21-30: (a) God's own righteousness--just as one refers to his holiness, (b) "God declaring righteous"--the justifying act of God, and (c) the status which this justifying act confers.

<sup>4</sup>V. Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," *op. cit.*, p. 298, in f.n. 1, observes: "The problem St. Paul is facing is whether God is both *δικαίος* and *ὁ δικάζων*."

to justify was in setting forth Christ Jesus as a *ἐλαστήριον* by the shedding of blood to be received by faith.

b. Rom. 3:25-26

Though the Revised Standard Version presents Rom. 3:21-26 in three sentences, the Greek has all these six verses in one sentence.<sup>1</sup> And as we begin considering the first part of verse 25, it is well to reread verses 21-24. The Revised Standard Version reads:

But now the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from law, although the law and the prophets bear witness to it, the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction; since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*) which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward (*ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς*) as an expiation (*ἐλαστήριον*) by his blood to be received by faith (*διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*) (Rom. 3:21-25a).

(1) Ἀπολύτρωσις

The first term to be considered is *ἀπολύτρωσις*.

---

<sup>1</sup>D. Eberhard Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine Utrumque textum cum apparatu critico imprimendum curavit* (Editio septima decima. Der griechische Teil entspricht, mit einigen kleinen Verbesserungen, der 21. Griech. Auflage (1952) (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1954), in *loc.*: *Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντες τοὺς πιστεύοντας· οὗ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολή· πάντες γὰρ ἡμάρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολύτρωσις τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιῶντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.*



Moffatt translates the term with "ransom."<sup>1</sup> Paul does not say to whom the ransom was paid, but then neither did Christ. Christ, also, was indefinite at this point, saying simply that "the Son of Man came . . . and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28 and Mark 10:45). The view that the ransom was paid to the Devil has no foundation in Scripture and has been abandoned by most modern scholars. Thayer takes the term as a metaphor indicating "deliverance through the death of Christ from the retributive wrath of a holy God and the merited penalty of sin."<sup>2</sup> This view has the advantage of taking the wrath of God seriously and personally.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See also p. 200 f.

<sup>2</sup>TLNT, p. 65. Thayer also considers the word at Eph. 1.7 and Col. 1.14 as having this usage.

Henry Alford, Dean of Canterbury, also took this position. See his The Greek Testament: With a Critically Revised Text: A Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; And a Critical and Exegetical Commentary for the Use of Theological Students and Ministers, 4 vols., Vol. II (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1886), p. 343.

<sup>3</sup>See p. 198.

C. H. Dodd, in The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 21, describes the wrath of God as an "archaic idea." And on p. 23 he concludes that Paul "retains it, not to describe the attitude of God to man, but to describe an inevitable process of cause and effect in a moral universe, . . ."

However, it is difficult to see how one can have personal love and not personal wrath.

Leon Morris has convincingly shown that, to speak of the wrath of God is not to deny his love, but that to deny a personal abhorrence of sin is to imply that "God personally is indifferent to moral evil." See Morris, "The Wrath of God."

In "The Wrath of God," p. 144, Morris cites not only Mark 3:5 where Jesus was angry, but many other Scriptural references, from the Gospels, from non-Pauline literature, and from Paul's letters including Romans. He quotes C. Anderson Scott: "Directly or indirectly St. Paul connects God with the idea of anger or wrath."

More likely, however, the word indicates, as Dodd suggests, the intervention of God to emancipate His people from bondage to sin,<sup>1</sup> and this would also involve the ransoming of the people from his wrath, which is evoked by sin. It is well to take ἀπολύτρωσις in the abstract rather than concrete sense.<sup>2</sup> Knox well observes:

Paul is thus alluding to God's act of redeeming us from our slavery to sin: in and through Christ he sets us free from both its guilt and power. . . . and at great cost to himself (i.e., Christ) set us free.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, Donald Baillie, God Was in Christ, An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 189, while writing of "The Cross and the Love of God," comments: "This does not mean that there is no place for the idea of the 'wrath' of God, or that 'the Wrath' from which we are saved is something impersonal and apart from God in New Testament thought, as Professor Dodd suggests."

Furthermore, Emil Brunner, The Mediator, A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith, translated by Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p. 445: "Only where man recognizes this reality of wrath does he take his guilt seriously; only then does he realize the personal character of God, and his own human personal relation to God. The rejection of the doctrine of the wrath of God--as 'anthropopathic'--is the beginning of the Pantheistic disintegration of the Christian Idea of God."

Brunner, as Baillie and Morris, denies that a consideration of the wrath of God detracts from the love of God, but contends that it enables us to appreciate the love of God all the more; pp. 486-487: "Only the God who loves us in spite of everything is the God of Love. . . . The essence of the Gospel consists in this, that here is a real event, a sign of the real gulf between God and man and a sign of the real movement of God, an event which shows up both the seriousness of our position and the unspeakable wonder of the Divine Love."

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," IB, 432: "When Moffatt translates ἀπολύτρωσις as 'ransom,' he correctly indicates the primary meaning of the term. The form of the word used here, however, is abstract rather than concrete, and suggests rather the act of ransoming than the ransom itself."

G. G. Findlay, in "Romans," pp. 817-831, PCB, p. 820, recognizes the broader meaning of deliverance, but prefers "recovery by ransom" to emphasize the idea of price.

<sup>3</sup>John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," IB, IX, 86.



It is true that "The emphasis is on the cost of man's redemption."<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it seems that translating ἀπολύτρωσις with "redemption" both conveys the idea of cost, as opposed to "deliverance" and yet at the same time stresses the entire act, as opposed to "ransom."

## (2) Προέθετο

The second phrase is οὐκ προέθετο δ θεός. The verb, προέθετο, has been taken in two different senses: (1) a purposing or establishing beforehand, and (2) setting forth publicly. In the other two instances in which the verb appears in the New Testament (Rom. 1:13; Eph. 1:9) it has the usage of "purpose." Godet<sup>2</sup> and many other scholars support the idea of "purpose."<sup>3</sup> Morison<sup>4</sup> and most modern scholars support the idea of "set forth."<sup>5</sup> It is agreed with Sanday

<sup>1</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>Godet, op. cit., pp. 253-254.

<sup>3</sup>James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, pp. 273-274, lists among others: Aquinas, Wycliffe, Wahl, Fritzsche, Oltramare, Chrysostom, Ostervald, Martin, Koppe, Schleusener. J. B. Phillips translates: "appointed."

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 274-279.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 278-279, lists among others: Pelagius, Luther, the Geneva Bible, Wetstein, Reiche, de Wette, Stuart, Hodge, Meyer, Philippi, Lange, and the Authorized Version.

And since the time of Morison the translations of Moffatt, Goodspeed, and the RSV, and commentators such as Alford, op. cit., in loc.; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., in loc.; Thayer, in TLNT, in loc.; and Marvin R. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament (London: James Nisbet and Co., Vol. II, 1891; Vol. III, 1890), III, in loc., prefer it. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, in loc.; Findlay, op. cit., in loc.; John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," IB, IX, in loc., and Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, translated by Carl C. Rasmussen (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1955), in loc., tacitly accept it.



and Headlam that:

Both meanings would be in full accordance with the teaching of St. Paul both elsewhere and in this Epistle. . . . But when we turn to the immediate context we find it so full of terms denoting publicity (πεφανέρωται, εἰς ἔνδειξιν, πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν) that the latter sense ("whom God set forth publicly") seems preferable. The Death of Christ is not only a manifestation of the righteousness of God, but a visible manifestation and one to which appeal can be made.<sup>1</sup>

Yet while the usage "setting forth publicly" is preferred, either usage given the verb clearly sets forth the divine initiative and action in the redemption and justification of men. This verb, with God as the subject, the doer, the actor, establishes the key and critical difference between the Pauline and the Hellenistic doctrine of propitiation, whatever other differences or similarities may be established.

Whatever may be the nature of ἔλασθήριον in Rom. 3:25, whatever may be the benefits that accrue to man because of it, whatever may be the changes in the relationship between God and man because of it, this verb preceding ἔλασθήριον with God as the subject destroys any effort to present Christ as trying to entice the Father to love instead of hate mankind. God has taken the initiative in providing Christ for our redemption, as a means of propitiation by the shedding of blood, to be received through faith.

We shall see that the ἔλασθήριον is objective as well as subjective, but the phrase "whom God set forth" should prevent anyone from attempting to oppose the Father and the Son

---

<sup>1</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 87.

in such a way that he thinks the love of Christ is opposed to the hate of God the Father.

The phrase under consideration is so clear that it alone could easily bear all the weight that has been put on it, great though that is. However, Paul has led up to this statement by referring to "the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe." That is, God has offered men the status which his justifying act in Christ confers if we believe, and that status is being acquitted, or being declared righteous.<sup>1</sup>

Paul then proceeds to emphasize this glorious act of God. "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified (δικαιούμενοι) freely (δωρεάν) by his grace (τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι)." Sanday and Headlam observe:

δωρεάν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι. Each of these phrases strengthens the other in a very emphatic way, the position of αὐτοῦ further laying stress on the fact that this manifestation of free favour on the part of God is unprompted by any other external cause than the one which is mentioned (διὰ τῆς ἀπολυστρώσεως).<sup>2</sup>

If one should ask who has provided the ἀπολύτρωσις in Christ Jesus, Paul answers that God has done the setting forth. Salvation is of God.

Indeed, while one of the differences in Hebrew and

---

<sup>1</sup>See John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," IB, IX, 428.

<sup>2</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 86.

The RSV renders δωρεάν "as a gift." Moffatt and Goodspeed translate "for nothing."

Hellenistic thought is the question of divine initiative, Paul not only stands in opposition to Hellenistic thought but has equaled and gone beyond most Hebraic thought. There are passages in the Old Testament which affirm God to be the sole and direct source of salvation: "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Ex. 20:2). Yet the people had also worked and labored and fought finally to arrive at the promised land. On another occasion, God had accepted a half-shekel in lieu of the lives of the people, but he did require that half-shekel.<sup>1</sup> In another situation, God had ordained the sacrificial system whereby a man might bring a lamb and the priest would make atonement for him.<sup>2</sup> God took the initiative, but man contributed his work; he paid the half-shekel or brought the lamb. Here Paul shows that we cannot be justified by works under the law God gave (Rom. 3:20); rather God has paid the ransom; he has provided a means of propitiation in Christ Jesus. Man can receive it only by faith (3:25).

There is no Hellenism in this aspect of Paul's doctrine of propitiation. Indeed, Paul's doctrine stands in opposition to it. There is a kinship with the Hebraic doctrine of propitiation, but the Pauline doctrine is not to be identified with it. Salvation in Hebraic thought rested ultimately on the grace of God and his initiative, but man had a more

---

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 30:11-16. See discussion on pp. 26-27, 38, 39.

<sup>2</sup>Lev. 1:1-4; 4:31-35; 5:6, et al. See also pp. 9-14, 28, and 32.



active role than with Paul. For Paul, God through Christ has provided our redemption, reconciliation, and a means of propitiation. We can receive it through faith. The Reformers echoed the doctrine of Paul with "sola gratia," "sola fide."

(3) Διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι

The third phrase is διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. Though διὰ πίστεως is omitted by Codex A, there is no serious reason for doubting its genuineness. On the other hand, though τῆς is found in Codex B and many late manuscripts, S, G\*, D\*, and several late manuscripts omit it, and it is probably to be rejected. However, this "is one of the cases in which it is not of the slightest exegetical or doctrinal moment whether of the two readings be assumed."<sup>1</sup> However, a variety of ways have been advocated by various scholars of relating the phrase to ἰλαστήριον and Paul's doctrine of propitiation.

(a) Deissmann

Deissmann gives the phrase a "pneumatic interpretation."<sup>2</sup> He points out that ἐν τῷ αἵματι Χριστοῦ can mean "in blood-fellowship with the exalted spiritual Christ."<sup>3</sup> He feels that "Redemption is continuously at work 'in' Christ

<sup>1</sup>James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, p. 307. For this textual problem see further, p. 306 ff in Morison.

Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., in loc., and Nestle's Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, in loc.

<sup>2</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," EB, III, col. 3035, f.n. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., col. 3035. See also Deissmann, "ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ und ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," ZWKE, pp. 211-212.

and faith comes to know, by experience of the blood-fellowship with Christ, that Christ has been sent into the world by God as an enduring *ἑλαιοτήριον*."<sup>1</sup>

Here "blood" refers not to the actual blood Christ publicly shed on the cross, but rather to the "blood-fellowship" that one in the church has in communion or "in Christ." "Faith" in this instance does not mean believing in the blood, or that faith of which Christ is the object, "but such faith as one can have in God only in virtue of being 'in Christ.'"<sup>2</sup>

Such a view is possible, but improbable. The tone of the entire passage, Rom. 3:21-26, is that in a concrete act, God has publicly set forth Christ as *ἑλαιοτήριον*, publicly to vindicate his righteousness and holiness while at the same time being a means to justify those who believe in Christ.

The position of Deissmann has been attacked by Denney.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, such modern commentators as John Knox,<sup>4</sup> C. H. Dodd,<sup>5</sup> T. W. Manson,<sup>6</sup> Vincent Taylor,<sup>7</sup> and Friedrich Büchsel<sup>8</sup> not only give interpretations which differ from Deissmann's, but do not even bother to consider his suggestion at this point.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," *EB*, III, col. 3035.

<sup>2</sup>Denney, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 155, f.n. 1.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, IX, in *loc.*

<sup>5</sup>Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, in *loc.*

<sup>6</sup>T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, in *loc.*

<sup>7</sup>Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," in *loc.*

<sup>8</sup>*TWNT*, III, in *loc.*

<sup>9</sup>And Deissmann himself, in "Mercy Seat," *EB*, III, and "ἱλαστήριον und ἱλαστήριον," *ZWNU*, puts this suggestion out at the very end of these respective studies.

## (b) Kittel

Kittel has proposed the explanation that διὰ πίστεως refers to the faith of Jesus<sup>1</sup> which went to the extent of shedding blood. Kittel concludes his study with the observation that God now proves himself righteous in the justification of all those who have Christ's faith.<sup>2</sup> Though the exegesis is illuminating at points, Kittel yet fails to establish that πίστεως refers to the faith that Christ had rather than to the faith we have in him.<sup>3</sup>

## (c) Calvin, Luther, and Morison

Calvin, Luther, and Morison have taken the phrase to indicate: through our faith in Christ's blood.<sup>4</sup> While this is certainly grammatically possible,<sup>5</sup> Vincent Taylor raises the objection that "in the teaching of St. Paul faith is always related to a person; it is out of harmony with New Testament teaching to speak of 'faith in his blood,'"<sup>6</sup> and this is no small objection to the suggested interpretation.

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Kittel, "Zur Erklärung von Röm. 3:21-26," pp. 217-233 in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Jahrgang 1907, p. 231.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 233.

<sup>3</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 83-84, in commenting on Rom. 3:22, cite a publication of Dr. Haussleiter wherein he maintains that πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a case of the subjective rather than the objective genitive. At this point Haussleiter's position would be similar to Kittel's.

After stating Haussleiter's position, they comment: "It has so far, we believe, met with no acceptance." And the same comment could be made regarding most scholars' attitude toward Kittel's position.

<sup>4</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 257.

<sup>5</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 89.

<sup>6</sup>Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 295.



Yet Gifford, who minimizes this objection to the suggested interpretation, decides that the context speaks against "through our faith in Christ's blood."<sup>1</sup>

(d) Godet, Gifford, et al.

The interpretation decided upon by Gifford, after Godet,<sup>2</sup> to be followed by Sanday and Headlam,<sup>3</sup> Vincent Taylor,<sup>4</sup> and Büchsel,<sup>5</sup> and expressed in the Revised Standard Version, Goodspeed's translation, and also that of Moffatt is that

The two clauses "through faith," and "in His own blood," are therefore parallel, and both depend on *ἑλασθήριον*: render, therefore, "Whom God set forth as a Propitiatory through faith in His own blood."<sup>6</sup>

It is felt this is the most accurate interpretation of the text and the thought of Paul. The *ἑλασθήριον*, though provided by God, must be appropriated through faith if it is to benefit a man. Again *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* stresses the thought of the life poured out in death, the death of Christ.<sup>7</sup>

(e) Summation

This phrase reveals no dependence of Paul on Hellenistic thought. It does have a relationship to the Hebraic concept of propitiation. But the phrase reveals differences from as

<sup>1</sup>Gifford, op. cit., pp. 91-92.

<sup>2</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 257. Godet does not repudiate the attempt of men such as Vincent, op. cit., III, 47, and others to connect "in His blood" with "set forth," though he does call it "unnatural."

<sup>3</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 89.

<sup>4</sup>Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 295.

<sup>5</sup>TWNT, III, 322, lines 12-15.

<sup>6</sup>Gifford, op. cit., p. 92.

<sup>7</sup>Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 297.

See also Denney, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, p. 158.

well as similarities to the Hebraic doctrine.

[1] Ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι

The phrase "ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι" expresses a Hebraic rather than a Hellenistic concept regarding propitiation. To be sure many Hellenistic religions made use of blood in their rites;<sup>1</sup> however, the examination of ἑλαστήριον in Greek thought revealed not one instance in which ἑλαστήριον was related to blood.<sup>2</sup> In one instance the adjective ἑλαστήριος modified θυσία,<sup>3</sup> but still blood was not mentioned, and for the most part ἑλαστήριον is related to gifts, statues, and monuments.<sup>4</sup>

In Hebraic thought, while ἑλαστήριον was not always associated with blood,<sup>5</sup> the relationship is often made.

ἑλαστήριον usually represents כַּפֹּרֶת, and the sprinkling of blood upon the "mercy seat" was one of the, if not the, mightiest means of propitiation and atonement which the Old Testament describes.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>A. Eustace Haydon, "Blood," in An Encyclopedia of Religion, ed., Vergilius Ferm (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945), p. 80: "Blood poured into the grave served to revive the shades of the Grecian dead who were pictured as hungry for blood. The blood bath was a cure for epilepsy. Blood was an effective means of purification from all forms of contagion, physical or moral. The blood baptism of the mysteries illustrates this use in a highly developed form."

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 178-184. Philo uses it to indicate the כַּפֹּרֶת, but the way in which he uses it indicates that he felt a Greek, not familiar with the Old Testament, would not naturally take it in this sense. For later usage, see pp. 185-193.

<sup>3</sup>See pp. 179-180.

<sup>4</sup>See p. 180 ff.

<sup>5</sup>See p. 71 ff., where Symmachus' version of Gen. 6:15 (LXX Gen. 6:16) is discussed.

<sup>6</sup>See Lev. 16:14-15.

When ἑλαστήριον is used in the Septuagint to render עֲרִיצָה, again it is closely related to "blood."<sup>1</sup> In IV Macc. 17:22, ἑλαστήριος or ἑλαστήριον and blood are intimately related.

In that "blood" indicates for Paul a life poured out in death in this instance, again in his use of the term there is noted a sharp difference from that of Hellenistic religions. The difference is that while the pagan gods sometimes die and certain benefits may accrue to the people, Christ died willingly. He loved us and gave himself for us. On the other hand, the pagan gods are viewed as dying by compulsion, "sometimes in bitterness and despair."<sup>2</sup>

Regarding Hebraic thought, the various animals which were sacrificed certainly could not be viewed as dying willingly because they loved the people on whose behalf they were slain. However, in the Suffering Servant passages of Isaiah, there is the thought of one who suffers willingly for the people.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, even as Paul presses the point that God

---

<sup>1</sup>See Eze. 43:18-20.

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Strachan, The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment, 3d ed. (London: Student Christian Movement Press, Ltd., 1951), p. 76, f.n. 1.

See also Bruce M. Metzger, "Mystery Religions, Relation of, to Early Christianity," pp. 771-773 in Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, ed., Lefferts A. Loetscher (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 772.

See further A. J. Toynbee, A Study of History, VI, 276 ff., 376-539.

<sup>3</sup>For a penetrating study of these passages, which concludes in giving them a Messianic interpretation, see:

Christopher R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deuter-Isaiah, An Historical and Critical Study (Oxford: The University Press, 1950).



has set Christ forth as *ἑλσστήριον*, the servant songs in Isaiah reflect the divine initiative in sending forth one who "has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows . . . wounded for our transgressions, . . ." <sup>1</sup>

In IV Macc. 17:20 ff., and indeed throughout the entire book, the martyrs die willingly on behalf of the people, and in IV Macc. 17:22 their willing death is related to both "blood" and *ἑλσστήριον*. However, the initiative of God is not so evident here as it is with Paul. <sup>2</sup>

## [2] Διὰ πίστεως

The phrase *διὰ πίστεως* emphasizes the Christian element in Paul's doctrine of propitiation as opposed to both Hellenistic and Hebraic thought. For in both the Septuagint and the intertestamental writings of the Jews, and in Hellenistic literature and inscriptions, *πίστις* is never joined with *ἑλσστήριον*. Much less is it ever stated that a person or thing is a *ἑλσστήριον διὰ πίστεως*. To be sure both Greeks and Hebrews had some faith that certain measures might make atonement for them with God, or they would not have performed

H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles (London: Duckworth, 1948), on p. 116 suggests the importance of Isaiah 53 to Paul in interpreting the death of Christ. See also pp. 125-133.

See further Hans Walter Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950), p. 99.

<sup>1</sup>Is. 53:4-5. The initiative of God is seen in such verses as Is. 42:1; 49:1-3. See also Is. 42:6 and 61:1, which may or may not be part of the "servant songs"; see North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, pp. 127-138.

<sup>2</sup>See p. 124, where Büchsel and Stauffer, however, both feel that God has willed and set forth these martyrs as the means of atonement.

them, but outside the New Testament, faith never has the importance in atonement that it does with Paul.

Though Paul may refer to Abraham or Hab. 2:4,<sup>1</sup> the Jewish thought going back at least to Ezra was that a Jew was justified by obedience to the law. Rom. 3:20, among other passages, clearly shows Paul's opposition to such a position. Indeed, Rom. 3:28 contrasts being justified by faith with being justified by law.

(4) Rom. 3:25b-26

Rom. 3:25b-26 states why a ἱλαστήριον was necessary. It was necessary "to declare his righteousness,"<sup>2</sup> "to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous."<sup>3</sup> "Righteousness" or "righteous" in these two instances is used to describe an attribute of God.<sup>4</sup>

(a) Verse 25b

Verse 25 says it was necessary for God to vindicate his righteousness "because in his divine forbearance he had pass<sup>ed</sup> X

---

<sup>1</sup>Nygren, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-92, gives a long discussion of Rom. 1:16-17. On p. 88 he points out that admittedly Paul's use of Hab. 2:4 does not coincide with the literal meaning of the Hebrew, but Paul saw a deeper significance in the passage. Nygren also points out that Paul's exegesis was in harmony with the rabbinical method.

<sup>2</sup>Rom. 3:25b (AV). The Greek reads: εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ.

Thayer, in *TLNT*, in *loc.*, agrees with Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 297, that ἔνδειξις has the usage of "showing forth," "proof," "manifestation, made in act" (compare προέθετο) as opposed to "communicating" as proposed by Anderson Scott.

<sup>3</sup>Rom. 3:26 (RSV). The Greek reads: πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ.

<sup>4</sup>Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 298: ". . . the main question at issue is whether God possesses the moral attribute of righteousness."

over former sins." The Greek reads: διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν  
τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Διὰ is to be taken in a causal, not a purposive, sense.<sup>1</sup>

Πάρεσιν has the usage of "pretermission," "passing over," "letting pass," "neglecting," or "disregarding," but not that of "forgiving."<sup>2</sup>

πάρεσις = "putting aside," temporary suspension of punishment which may at some later date be inflicted; ἀφεσις = "putting away," complete and unreserved forgiveness.

Ἀνοχή with the usage of "toleration" or "forbearance" also implies something that is not complete and permanent. Sanday and Headlam rightly observe: "ἀνοχή is related to πάρεσις as χάρις is related to ἀφεσις."<sup>4</sup> It is further agreed with Sanday and Headlam that the phrase in the dative denotes motive rather than temporality, i.e., it is to be understood "because of the forbearance of God" and not "during the forbearance of God."<sup>5</sup>

Thus because God has, in his forbearance, temporarily passed over sins in the past, something must be done if God is to vindicate his righteousness.

#### (b) Verse 26

Verse 26 says the ἐλαστήριον "was to prove at the

<sup>1</sup>H. G. Meecham, "Romans 11. 25f., iv. 25--the meaning of διὰ c. acc.," p. 564 in The Expository Times, Vol. L, Oct. 1938-Sept. 1939 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).

<sup>2</sup>TLNT, in loc.

<sup>3</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 90.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. This also agrees with the translation of the RSV.



present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus."<sup>1</sup> The Greek reads: *πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.*

It is unfortunate that the Revised Standard Version could not find cognate English words to translate the cognate Greek terms in Rom. 3:26b: *δίκαιον* and *δικαιοῦντα*.<sup>2</sup> Paul sets forth here what is to him the key reason for the *ἔλασθήριον*:<sup>3</sup> that God can be righteous, as an attribute, and at the same time counting righteous those who have faith in Jesus Christ. Paul is saying that in view of the *ἔλασθήριον* God is just and justifies those who have faith in Christ.

The *ἔλασθήριον* showed that sin mattered, that it cost even God to redeem us from it and the penalty of the law. It shows that forgiveness is not cheap. Its purpose is that God may not hold man to the penalty of the moral law and yet may not simply turn his back on that law. Its purpose is that God may be just and justifying.

The words of James Denney stress both the justice and

---

<sup>1</sup>RSV.

<sup>2</sup>Some other translators do better than the RSV in this respect:

"... showing that God is just Himself and that He justifies man on the score of faith in Jesus." Moffatt.

"... that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." AV.

"... and by showing in the present time that He is a just God, and that He justifies every man who has faith in Jesus Christ." Phillips.

<sup>3</sup>Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 298, f.n. 1.

justifying action of God and the consequent necessity of the *ἔλασθήριον*, and are worth stressing:

This is of the very essence of the *ἔλασθήριον* as Paul understands it. It bears witness, of course, to the goodness of God, for it is God who provides it, out of pure love, and it is the way of salvation; but it bears witness also to His severity, to His inexorable repulsion of evil, to a righteousness on which no shadow of moral unreality must ever fall. This is as important to Paul as that God should be<sup>a</sup> forgiving and justifying God. He must also be a true God, to whom sin is what it is, nothing else and nothing less; and in the propitiation which deals with sin as it is with a view to its removal He is revealed in both characters at once.<sup>1</sup>

No doubt this propitiation has value also for men, and is intended to appeal to them, but what it does in the first instance is to meet divine necessities, the realities of the moral world as they exist in the order of God.<sup>2</sup>

In other words, it (propitiation) is divinely necessary--necessary not only with a view to impressing men, but necessary in order that God may be true to Himself and to the moral order He has established in the world--that sin, in the very process in which it is forgiven, should also, in all its reality, be borne. . . . It is the satisfaction of divine necessities, and it has value not only for us, but for God.<sup>3</sup>

#### (c) Summation

Paul's view that God is concerned to demonstrate his own righteousness and holiness is surely in accord with Hebraic<sup>4</sup> rather than Hellenistic thought, which often regarded the gods as practicing a far lower degree of morality than that of the humans who worshipped them.

In regard to God's justifying action as indicated by *δικαιοῦντα*, the accusative singular masculine present

<sup>1</sup>James Denney, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, p. 159.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 161-162.

<sup>4</sup>Ps. 119:137; 145:17; Lev. 19:2, et al.

active participle of *δικαίω*, Dodd<sup>1</sup> and Schrenk<sup>2</sup> have demonstrated that such usage is not found in secular Greek but only in the Septuagint and the New Testament.<sup>3</sup>

The elaboration on Paul's part as to the purpose of *ἰλαστήριον* is interesting and important. The point he stresses is not that it enables man to avoid the wrath of God, though that is part of the purpose and result. He stresses that it vindicates the righteousness of God. Such concern is absent in all Hellenistic thought.

Paul, so to speak, looks at *ἰλαστήριον* more from God's viewpoint than from man's. Erdman is right; for Paul "the supreme element in propitiation is the vindicating of divine righteousness."<sup>4</sup>

#### (5) *ἰλαστήριον*

*ἰλαστήριον* has been interpreted in a number of ways, both grammatically and theologically.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 42-59. See also Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, pp. 8-12, 51-53.

<sup>2</sup>Schrenk, TWNT, II, 180-229, and in the English translation in Quell and Schrenk, Righteousness, p. 56 ff.

<sup>3</sup>Schrenk, in Quell and Schrenk, Righteousness, p. 57, after referring to one type of usage of *δικαίω* in secular Greek, writes: "The last comes nearest to Paul's usage, but it is only in LXX and N.T. that it means justifying a person."

See also pp. 202-204.

<sup>4</sup>Charles R. Erdman, An Exposition. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1925), p. 53.

<sup>5</sup>An excellent discussion of scholarship up to the 1860's is given by James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, p. 279 ff. A more recent study of the word is that of Morris, "The Meaning of *ἰλαστήριον*." See also in the bibliography other works by Leon Morris together with studies by C. H. Dodd, Herrmann and Büchsel, T. W. Manson, W. D. Davies, Vincent Taylor, and most commentaries.



## (a) Masculine Adjective

ἑλαστήριον has been taken as a masculine adjective used to modify the relative οὗ.<sup>1</sup> Regarding this possibility, Leon Morris has rightly observed:

Grammatically there is nothing against this, and when all is said and done it must remain as a possible understanding of the term, the only important objection, it would seem, being the statistical one, that ἑλαστήριον occurs quite often as a neuter noun and only rarely as an adjective. We cannot assume that Paul used the rarer rather than the more usual form without some good evidence, and some such does not seem to be adduced. We conclude therefore that ἑλαστήριον in this passage is probably the noun.<sup>2</sup>

## (b) Θῆμα Understood

If the statistics do not favor considering ἑλαστήριον as a masculine adjective with some usage, such as "whom God set forth in propitiatory power," even less do they favor taking the word as a noun with θῆμα understood, so that it reads "propitiatory sacrifice."<sup>3</sup> In spite of the fact that

---

<sup>1</sup>So Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," in The Expositor's Greek Testament, II, 611: "whom God set forth in propitiatory power."

Also Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., in loc.: Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 296.

Stewart, op. cit., p. 215.

H. A. A. Kenney, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of ἑλαστήριον," p. 34.

<sup>3</sup>Robert Haldane, Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans: with remarks on the commentaries of Dr. Macknight, Professor Moses Stuart, and Professor Tholuck, 9th ed. (Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Co., 1874), p. 150.

Moses Stuart, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: with a translation and various excursions, 6th ed. (London: William Tegg and Co., 1857), pp. 151-152.

Alford, op. cit., II, 343, renders it "propitiatory offering."

Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 295-296, interprets ἑλαστήριον as "propitiatory sacrifice."

W. Sanday has a leaning towards this position though he cannot go all the way with it. In A Bible Commentary

the verb *προέθετο* preceding *ἐλαστήριον* and *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* following indicate Paul probably did view Christ's death in this instance in a sacrificial manner,<sup>1</sup> there is no clear instance of any use of *ἐλαστήριον* in such a manner in either Biblical or Hellenistic Greek.<sup>2</sup>

---

for English Readers, ed., Charles John Ellicott, Vol. VII (London and Edinburgh: Marshall Brothers, Ltd., n.d.), p. 218, he suggests: "We should translate, therefore, a propitiatory or expiatory (sacrifice)."

Goodspeed, op. cit., translates "a sacrifice of reconciliation."

Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," p. 33, f.n. 4, lists others that have shown some tendency towards this view.

J. Barmby, in Romans, in The Pulpit Commentary, edited by H. D. M. Spence and Joseph S. Exell, new edition (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd., 1901), p. 84: "The difficulty is avoided if we take the word here in the sense of propitiatory offering, which in itself it will bear, a noun, such as *θῆμα*, being supplied to be understood (cf. 4 Macc. xvii, 22; Josephus, 'Ant.,' xvi, c. 7; Dio Chrys., 'Orat.,' xi. 1)."

<sup>1</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 87-89, 91-94.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," p. 33.

See discussions of this point by Deissmann in Bible Studies, pp. 129-130; in "*ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ* und *ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ*," ZWKU, p. 198; and especially in "Mercy Seat," EB, III, col. 3032, section (d), where strong evidence is offered against "understanding" *θῆμα*.

James Morrison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, pp. 293-303, has made a detailed study of this proposed interpretation. He agrees, as does this thesis, on p. 294: "It is undoubtedly, in substance at least, and so far as doctrinal exegesis is concerned, the correct interpretation of the Apostle's expression." But he concludes, as does this thesis, on p. 303: "The result of our investigation is, that there is no passage yet adduced at which our word, *ἐλαστήριον*, is used as a substantive signifying a propitiatory sacrifice."

For a discussion of the references cited by Barmby, and of other instances too, see pp. 121-125 and 178-190 in this study. Note especially the discussion of fragment 337 in Fayum Towns and Their Papyri on pp. 178-179.



## (c) Masculine Noun

ἰλαστήριον could also possibly be a masculine noun, and such scholars as Wyclif, Erasmus, Melancthon, and Aquinas are among those who have given it some such usage.<sup>1</sup> However, it is probably to be rejected because such usage of the word is not found in ancient Greek, Biblical or Hellenistic.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, if Paul had wanted to designate Christ explicitly as "propitiator" or "reconciler" with a minimum of ambiguity, he would have used ἰλαστής.<sup>3</sup>

## (d) Neuter Noun

Assuming Paul would use the more common rather than the rarer form of the word in this one instance that he uses it, ἰλαστήριον is probably to be considered in this instance a neuter noun derived from the neuter adjective.<sup>4</sup> However,

---

<sup>1</sup>See Morris, "The Meaning of ἰλαστήριον," p. 34, for more references and their translations.

See further James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, pp. 284-285, and Gifford, op. cit., p. 98. Though Morris, Morison, and Gifford all list additional scholars who have taken ἰλαστήριον in this way, they all reject this as the probable interpretation.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 121-125 and 178-190, and also Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," EB, III, col. 3033, Sect. 8(a).

Morris rightly observes in "The Meaning of ἰλαστήριον," p. 34: "Despite these great names, this understanding is to be rejected, for in the first place, such a use of ἰλαστήριον does not seem to be attested from antiquity, . . ."

<sup>3</sup>See Morris, "The Meaning of ἰλαστήριον," p. 34, and James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, p. 285.

LSGL, p. 828, in loc., gives ἰλαστής the sole usage of "propitiator."

<sup>4</sup>James Hope Moulton and Wilbert Francis Howard, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), II, 342, where it is taken as denoting instrument or means.

TLNT, p. 301, in loc.

Robertson, op. cit., p. 475.



deciding that *ἑλαστήριον* is a neuter noun in Greek by no means settles the exact sense with which it is to be rendered in English.

### [1] The Means of Propitiation

It has been rendered "the means of propitiation,"<sup>1</sup> but with no definite article before *ἑλαστήριον*, this is too demonstrative a translation.<sup>2</sup>

### [2] כִּפּוּרֵי תַת

"A large number of interpreters suppose that the Apostle, in using the word, has direct reference to the golden covering of the ark of the covenant."<sup>3</sup> The thought is that

Morris, "The Meaning of *ἑλαστήριον*," p. 34.

Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," *EB*, Vol. III, col. 3033, Sect. 8(a) and (b).

Hans Lietzmann, *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer*, Dritte Auflage, Band 8 in *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928), p. 49.

Büchsel, *TWNT*, III, 320, lines 9-20.

<sup>1</sup>Moffatt translates: "the means of propitiation."

<sup>2</sup>James Morison, *A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans*, p. 286: "Sharpe translates the word too demonstratively, 'the means of propitiation.'"

See also Morris, "The Meaning of *ἑλαστήριον*," p. 40.

<sup>3</sup>James Morison, *A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans*, p. 286. On pp. 288-289 he lists a large number of scholars that have maintained this interpretation, including: Theodoret, Luther, Tyndale, Calvin, Grotius, Cocceius, Vitringa, John Locke, Wakefield, Seb. Schmidt, Baumgarten, Philippi, Lange, and Tholuck in his fifth edition.

Since Morison sees:

John Forbes, *Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, tracing the train of thought by the aid of parallelism, with notes and dissertations on the principal difficulties connected with the exposition of the Epistle (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1868), p. 166.

Ernst Gaugler, *Der Römerbrief* (1 Teil: Kapitel 1-8) in *Prophezei-Schweizerisches Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1945), p. 89.

Gifford, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

Christ is the fulfillment and perfection of what the כַּפִּיתָה was but a type and forerunner in the Old Testament. Below follows a brief tabulation of the major reasons for advocating this view and some replies made to objections to this interpretation.<sup>1</sup>

1. ἐλαστήριον is used in the Septuagint as the usual translation of the כַּפִּיתָה or "mercy seat."

2. The fact that God set forth Christ publicly on the cross while the כַּפִּיתָה was hidden merely shows the contrast between the law and the gospel. It shows that the veil of the temple has been rent.

3. The lack of a definite article before ἐλαστήριον merely indicates that the reference is not to the specific

---

T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 4-5.  
 Schlatter, op. cit., p. 146.  
 Vincent, op. cit., III, 43-47.  
 Büchsel, TWNT, III, 322, line 16 - p. 323, line 6.  
 Anders Nygren, op. cit., pp. 156-158.  
 H. P. Liddon, Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893), p. 75.

W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), objects to an identification of ἐλαστήριον with כַּפִּיתָה, pp. 239-240: "The absence of the article does suggest that Paul is not referring to any such well known object as the כַּפִּיתָה." But he adds, p. 240: "... Manson seems justified in finding in Rom. 3.25 the meaning that Christ crucified was 'the place where God's mercy was supremely manifested.'"

<sup>1</sup>A good list of reasons for supporting this translation and a reply to the objections of Meyer are found in Gifford, op. cit., pp. 96-98.

A criticism of this translation is found in V. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 39, f.n. 3.

A critique of Taylor's objections is in W. D. Davies, op. cit., p. 239 f.

Probably the latest and best consideration of this translation is that of Leon Morris in "The Meaning of ἐλαστήριον."

תִּפְחָדִי that covered the ark but to Christ as the perfect type of the mercy seat.

4. That this would be the only instance of such a designation is no sure argument against it since Christ is designated once and once only as "the Rock" (I Cor. 10:2).

5. The mercy seat in the Day of Atonement was intimately connected with the manifestation of God, God's wrath, His glory, the blood, and God's mercy. This same group of thoughts is present in Romans 3.<sup>1</sup>

However, it is not without cause that Morison writes that this "interpretation, though venerable for its antiquity, and estimable for its evangelical relationships and aspirations, is too narrow, too artificial, and too bizarre to be legitimate."<sup>2</sup>

In regard to the claim that ἐλαστήριον is used in the Septuagint as the usual translation of תִּפְחָדִי, our earlier study of ἐλαστήριον as used in the Septuagint and other Greek versions of the Old Testament has indicated that ἐλαστήριον was not identified with תִּפְחָדִי but had a much more general usage, such as "means of atonement" or "instrument or means of propitiation."<sup>3</sup> Neither was such identification made in IV Maccabees,<sup>4</sup> written near the same

<sup>1</sup>James Morison, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans, p. 290.

<sup>2</sup>See Nygren, op. cit., pp. 156-157.

<sup>3</sup>See pp. 57-74 and 77-78.

See also the discussions on this point in Deissmann's Bible Studies, "Mercy Seat," EB, III; "ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ und ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," ZWKU, p. 208, in Morris, "The Meaning of ἐλαστήριον," especially p. 36.

<sup>4</sup>See pp. 121-125.



time as Romans.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Josephus does not use ἑλαστήριον as a synonym of the תָּרִבִּיץ in any way.<sup>2</sup> Philo uses ἑλαστήριον to indicate the תָּרִבִּיץ, but only when he also uses such words and phrases as "lid of the ark," "Cherubim," or "which is called in the sacred books." On the whole, the evidence of Philo is also against the tacit identification of ἑλαστήριον and תָּרִבִּיץ.<sup>3</sup> Needless to say, in secular Greek, ἑλαστήριον was not interpreted as the תָּרִבִּיץ.<sup>4</sup>

ἑλαστήριον, with the article τὸ, does appear in Heb. 9:5, but this situation is very different from Romans, as Leon Morris observes:

We have already noted that, while the LXX often uses ἑλαστήριον of the תָּרִבִּיץ, this is not invariable, and even where it is found, the article is prefixed, and there is some reference in the context to the ark or the cherubim. We find this usage in the only other place in the New Testament where ἑλαστήριον occurs, namely Heb. ix.4-5, "the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold . . . and above it cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat." Here the writer mentions both the ark and the cherubim, and he uses the article with ἑλαστήριον. But all three are absent from Romans iii, and we must recognize that what Paul says is that Christ was set forth to be "a propitiation" not "the propitiation," while the context is barren of any reference to surrounding objects of furniture. It is very difficult to see in this general term, used in a general way, an allusion to a specific article of the Temple furniture.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See p. 115.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 179-180, especially f.n. 4, p. 180.

<sup>3</sup>See pp. 182-184.

<sup>4</sup>Alfred E. Garvil (ed.), Romans. Introduction, Authorized Version, Revised Version with Notes, Illustrations, in The Century Bible (London: Blackwood, LeBas and Co., n.d.), p. 131: "The arguments both for and against this view are ingenious rather than convincing, but on the whole it is improbable Paul would have introduced an allusion so obscure to the majority of his readers without some fuller explanation."

<sup>5</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of ἑλαστήριον," pp. 39-40.

Moreover, Morris points out that when Paul refers to Christ as our passover, he uses both the article and the pronoun to make the meaning clear.<sup>1</sup>

When it is seen that ἐλαστήριον was not a synonym of כִּסֵּא חַסְדִּים in the Septuagint, in Symmachus' version of the Old Testament, in IV Maccabees, or in Josephus, the first and main argument why ἐλαστήριον should be considered as "mercy seat" in Rom. 3:25 falls.

When it is seen that ἐλαστήριον can by no means be identified with כִּסֵּא חַסְדִּים as a matter of course, the verb προέθετο no longer serves to contrast type and anti-type but to serve as one more mark underlining the difference in ἐλαστήριον in Rom. 3:25 and the כִּסֵּא חַסְדִּים.<sup>2</sup>

When it is observed that ἐλαστήριον is not equivalent to the כִּסֵּא חַסְדִּים, even the presence of the article would not make it necessary to identify ἐλαστήριον in Rom. 3:25 with the "mercy seat." Yet the absence of the article does make the likelihood of a reference to the כִּסֵּא חַסְדִּים or even a consideration of ἐλαστήριον as the realized idea of the כִּסֵּא חַסְדִּים<sup>3</sup> even less likely.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 40: "Contrast the way in which Paul refers to the Passover in I Cor. v. 7, τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν, where the article and the pronoun reinforce the natural meaning of the term πάσχα to make the meaning clear. There is no equivalent in Romans iii."

See also Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," in The Expositor's Greek Testament, II, 611.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of ἐλαστήριον," p. 42.

<sup>3</sup>Gifford, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>4</sup>W. D. Davies, op. cit., p. 239 f. This is the main objection Davies sees in the identification of ἐλαστήριον with the כִּסֵּא חַסְדִּים. In Heb. 9:5, where τὸ ἐλαστήριον

Those that favor the interpretation "mercy seat" are probably right in not letting the fact that this is the only time Paul uses *ἐλαστήριον* to refer to Christ or the fact that the figure would be rather complicated weigh heavily on their minds.<sup>1</sup> However, when Paul describes Christ as the rock, the Greek is very specific.<sup>2</sup> In any event, however, the fact that these objections may not weigh heavily against the idea of "mercy seat" in no way constitutes an argument in favor of this interpretation.

The argument in favor of "mercy seat" on the basis that Paul here has in mind essentially the same subjects that were associated with the *כַּפֶּרֶת* has been given the following reply by Morris:

But these things do not necessarily direct attention to the *כַּפֶּרֶת*. God might manifest himself in a burning bush; his wrath might be put away by means other than the ceremonies associated with the *כַּפֶּרֶת* (as in Exod. xxxii. 10-14); his glory is everywhere to be seen in the Old Testament, and does not seem to be at all closely linked with the *כַּפֶּרֶת*; the blood was far more often sprinkled elsewhere than on the *כַּפֶּרֶת*. None of these ideas leads us naturally and inevitably to the *כַּפֶּרֶת*, and even their conjunction seems perfectly explicable in terms of the great general idea which Paul was unfolding, and without reference to the mercy-seat.<sup>3</sup>

Yet in spite of all Morris says, it still seems that the

---

refers to the *כַּפֶּרֶת*, not only is the article present, but the context, speaking of "the cherubim" and "the tablets of the covenant," makes the association clear.

<sup>1</sup>See W. D. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 239; Gifford, *op. cit.*, p. 97; *TWNT*, III, 322, lines 35-36.

In Rom. 7:1 ff. Paul gives an illustration that becomes even more complicated.

<sup>2</sup>Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latina*, in *loc.*

I Cor. 10:4b: "ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός."

<sup>3</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," p. 39.



one single instrument that was associated with all these subjects was the mercy seat. Nevertheless, not only would mere appropriateness not be sufficient reason to consider *ἑλαστήριον* in Rom. 3:25 as "mercy seat" in the face of the previously raised objections, but all these subjects are equally appropriate to be related to *ἑλαστήριον* if it is given a more general interpretation.

Consequently while the concept of the mercy seat harmonizes with the thought of Paul at this point<sup>1</sup> and some objections raised against this view are not very serious, yet the context also harmonizes with *ἑλαστήριον* taken in a more general sense. Too, some objections, such as the verb *προέθετο* and the absence of the article, are more serious objections to "mercy seat" as an interpretation. But the chief reason for rejecting such usage is a careful study of the use of *ἑλαστήριον* in the Septuagint and later religious writings of the Jewish people, wherein it does not automatically designate the "mercy seat."

### [3] General Usage

A more general usage is given to *ἑλαστήριον* in both the Authorized Version: "a propitiation," and the Revised Standard version: "an expiation,"<sup>2</sup> and by several

---

<sup>1</sup>The objection against "mercy seat" that Paul was not thinking in Levitical terms has been called upon to carry more weight than it will bear. See W. D. Davies, op. cit., p. 239.

<sup>2</sup>Goodspeed brings in the sacrificial idea, translating, "a sacrifice of reconciliation."

Moffatt makes it more definite: "the means of propitiation," though it is also to be observed that Moffatt

scholars.<sup>1</sup> Reasons have already been set forth why a general instrumental usage is preferred.<sup>2</sup> Yet the question as to whether ἑλαστήριον should be rendered into English as "expiation" or "propitiation" is still to be decided.

### [a] Expiation

C. H. Dodd has made it clear that the difference between "expiation" and "propitiation" is of more moment to him than whether ἑλαστήριον is taken as an adjective or noun.<sup>3</sup> In

---

emphasizes the instrumental nature of ἑλαστήριον.

Phillips indicates the instrumental nature of ἑλαστήριον and tries to combine the definite and indefinite usage with "the means of propitiation, a propitiation . . ."

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 55.

Godet, op. cit., p. 255.

John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," IB, IX, 432-433.

Meyer, op. cit., p. 171.

Morris, "The Meaning of ἑλαστήριον," p. 43.

Handley C. G. Moule, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894), p. 93.

George Barker Stevens, The Pauline Theology, A Study of the Origin and Correlation of the Doctrinal Teachings of the Apostle Paul, rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), p. 239.

Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," p. 297.

<sup>2</sup>See especially pp. 60-64, but also pp. 57-74; 77-78; 121-125; 178-193.

Godet, op. cit., p. 255, sums the matter up very well: "We must therefore use the word ἑλαστήριον in a very wide sense: a means of propitiation."

Büchsel, who prefers a more specific usage of ἑλαστήριον notes that the specificity or generality of the designation is not of the first importance for him in TWNT, III, 321, lines 31-36: "Wären diese Besonderheiten der תַּרְבִּיבִּי - Vorstellung hier von Belang, so würde Paulus irgendwie auf sie hinweisen. Der Unterschied zwischen den beiden Auffassungen von ἑλαστήριον ist gering, im Grunde nur der: knüpft Paulus hier an die jüdische Vorstellung vor der Sühnung der Sünden im Allgemeinen an oder an die von einer besonderen Form dieser Sühnung?"

<sup>3</sup>See Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 55, however, where he considers it a substantive.

the following quotation he not only indicates that he prefers "expiation" but that he considers Paul at this point to be guided by the Septuagint and not Hellenistic Greek:

Here it is unnecessary for our present purpose to decide whether *ἐλαστήριον* is an adjective in the accusative singular masculine or a neuter substantive. In any case the meaning conveyed (in accordance with LXX usage, which is constantly determinative for Paul), is that of expiation, not that of propitiation. Most translators and commentators are wrong.<sup>1</sup>

In his commentary on Romans, Dodd also states his belief that Paul derives his usage from the Old Testament rather than Hellenistic usage, and he develops in more detail his interpretation of *ἐλαστήριον*:

In accordance with biblical usage, therefore, the substantive ( *ἐλαστήριον* ) would mean, not propitiation, but "a means by which guilt is annulled": if a man is the agent, the meaning would be "a means of expiation"; if God, "a means by which sin is forgiven." Biblical usage is determinative for Paul. The rendering propitiation is therefore misleading, for it suggests the placating of an angry God, and although this would be in accord with pagan usage, it is foreign to biblical usage. In the present passage it is God who puts forward the means whereby sin is removed, by sending Christ. The sending of Christ, therefore, is the divine method of forgiveness.<sup>2</sup>

Knox supports the rendering "expiation" as opposed to "propitiation."<sup>3</sup> However, he takes the wrath of God seriously<sup>4</sup> and views this "expiation" as "vicarious satisfaction."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 55.

<sup>3</sup>John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," IB, IX, 431-433.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 461.

<sup>5</sup>John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954), p. 134: "But it is almost as clear that when he 'explains' Christ's death as having been, in some sense, the payment of a debt or penalty, an act of obedience and devotion offered to God on man's behalf which



The fact that Knox does not care for this element in Paul but nevertheless feels bound to admit its presence<sup>1</sup> is strong evidence that this idea of "vicarious satisfaction" is present in Rom. 3:25.

### [b] Propitiation

Contrary to Dodd's thesis, Leon Morris has shown that *ἱλαστήριον* and its cognate verbs *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* and *ἱλάσκεσθαι* have had on more than one occasion the usage of designating the act or action that enables the wrath of God to be avoided.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, our study of the usage of this group of words in the Septuagint indicates that they can on occasion indicate "propitiation" in a crude sense,<sup>3</sup> and when the usage is "to forgive" the alternative is the personal wrath of God and destruction.<sup>4</sup>

Leon Morris emphasizes the fact that words of the *ἱλάσκεσθαι* group involve the averting of the divine

---

made possible the righteous God's acquitting sinful men, he is speaking no less realistically. Modern writers sometimes try hard to 'relieve' Paul of any serious belief that Christ's death had this kind of significance, but they do not succeed. Such passages as Rom. 3:24-26; 5:6-11 clearly point the other way (see pp. 151-52). We cannot take Paul's allusions to Christ's vicarious satisfaction of God's demands any more than his reference to Christ's defeat of our demonic adversaries as being mere metaphor."

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 146-155.

<sup>2</sup>See Morris: "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," "The Wrath of God," "The Use of *ἱλάσκεσθαι*," and "The Meaning of *ἱλαστήριον*."

<sup>3</sup>Num. 24:13 is only the most outstanding. In some instances, such as Ex. 32:14 (see p. 46), the situation presupposes propitiation.

<sup>4</sup>Jer. 18:23 is one of the clearest but by no means the only examples of this.

wrath<sup>1</sup> and contends that *ἐλαστήριον* should therefore "be understood as something like 'means of propitiation.'"<sup>2</sup> Morris, while agreeing with Dodd that the Septuagint usage of *ἐλάσκεσθαι* does not indicate "a process of celestial bribery,"<sup>3</sup> has yet indicated that the wrath of God is a concept to be taken seriously and personally in the Septuagint,<sup>4</sup> and that the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group of words indicate the averting of that wrath.<sup>5</sup>

Now while the idea of "expiation" should also involve the implication that the person on whose behalf expiation has been made has been delivered from the wrath of God, the implication is often overlooked; expiation is sometimes used in a depersonalized sense.<sup>6</sup>

The contrast between expiation and propitiation can be highlighted as the paying of a fine for a violation of an impersonal law on the one hand and the restoration of a friendly relation and the avoidance of wrath on the other hand. Of course in dealing with God, propitiation includes expiation, for God will not wink at sin, but it is a richer and a warmer

---

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," p. 33, f.n. 2: "I have given my reasons for thinking that the words of the *ἐλάσκεσθαι* group are to be understood in terms of the averting of the divine wrath, rather than of expiation simply, as is frequently maintained, in an article in the Expository Times, LXII, 227 ff. Propitiation may not be a very good word to describe this, but we do not seem to have a better."

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 33. See also, p. 43 in the same work.

<sup>3</sup>Morris, "The Use of *ἐλάσκεσθαι*," p. 227.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 227 ff.; see also Morris, "The Wrath of God,"

<sup>5</sup>Morris, "The Use of *ἐλάσκεσθαι*," p. 227 ff. See also Chapter I.

<sup>6</sup>Morris, "The Wrath of God," p. 145.

term--and also a more dangerous term since it is more likely to be associated with "appeasement" than expiation.

A brief summary of the usage of *ἐλαστήριον* encountered in our study may help decide which word is the better translation. In the Septuagint "means of expiation," "means of propitiation," or "means of atonement" may each suffice to translate the term.<sup>1</sup> However, when Symmachus uses it of Noah's ark in his version of the Old Testament, the primary thought is that the ark enables those within to avoid the wrath of God, and "means of instrument of propitiation" is the preferable translation here.<sup>2</sup> The appearance of *ἐλαστήριον* in IV Maccabees where the blood, the death, of the martyrs enabled Israel to feel the graciousness rather than the wrath of God has several points of similarity to our passage in Romans and is especially important, being written at about the same time.<sup>3</sup> Here the thought is of "propitiation" and not "expiation."<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the usage of *ἐλαστήριον* in secular Greek also leans in the direction of "propitiation" rather than "expiation."<sup>5</sup> Consequently, unless the context in Romans provides strong argument to the contrary, *ἐλαστήριον* should also be translated "a means of propitiation" there too.

---

<sup>1</sup>See p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 71-74.

<sup>3</sup>See p. 115.

<sup>4</sup>See pp. 121-125, especially pp. 123-124.

See also Morris, "The Meaning of *ἐλαστήριον*," pp. 40, 42-43.

<sup>5</sup>See pp. 178-184.



Rom. 1:18 states "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness . . ." And the rest of Chapter 1 is a condemnation of the Gentiles. In Chapter 2 Paul turns to show the Jews that they too are under the wrath of God.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, in Rom. 3:5-6 he defends the right of God to "inflict wrath on the world." Yet in Rom. 3:21-26 where Paul describes God's saving act, *ἐλαστήριον* is the only word to indicate that we have also been saved from the wrath of God. Morris well observes:

The context demands that *ἐλαστήριον* should include an element of propitiation in its meaning, for St. Paul has brought heavy artillery to bear in demonstrating that God's wrath and judgment are against the sinner, and while other expressions in vv. 21-26 may be held to deal with the judgment aspect, there is nothing other than this word to express the averting of the wrath. Wrath has occupied such an important place in the argument leading up to this section that we are justified in looking for some expression indicative of its cancellation in the process which brings about salvation.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, Paul apparently feels in 3:25b that Christ as *ἐλαστήριον* also enabled God to be just and at the same time to pass over many sins in the past and not visit his wrath upon the sinners as would have been necessary otherwise.

Both the usage of the word and the context of the situation indicate *ἐλαστήριον* should be rendered "a means of

---

<sup>1</sup>Rom. 2:5: "But by your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed."

See the treatment of this section in Morris, "The Use of *ἐλάσκεισθαι*," pp. 231-232.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 232.

propitiation." In regard to the danger of associating "propitiation" with "appeasement,"<sup>1</sup> the clear statement that God provides and sets forth Christ as the *ἑλαστήριον* should negate the risk.<sup>2</sup>

### 3. Conclusions

Scholars tend to agree that, whatever may be the Hellenistic elements in some Pauline doctrines, the Hebraic element as transmitted through the medium of the Septuagint is determinative in regard to propitiation. C. H. Dodd comments on Rom. 3:25: "Biblical usage is determinative for Paul."<sup>3</sup> Leon Morris, though giving an interpretation to this passage different from that of Dodd, does not claim that Paul was influenced by Hellenistic thought as opposed to Hebraic. He seems to agree with Dodd as to the moulding influence of Biblical thought for Paul, for his method of opposing Dodd is to reexamine the words and ideas in the Old Testament that are especially relevant to this section of Romans.<sup>4</sup> Ethelbert Stauffer shares this basic view,<sup>5</sup> and adds that the 'hellenization' of Christianity did not take place until the second

---

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 236-237.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 207-211.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 55. See also Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 94. In commenting on Rom. 3:25 he notes in parentheses: "(in accordance with LXX usage, which is constantly determinative for Paul)."

<sup>4</sup>See Morris, "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," "The Use of *ἐλάσκειν*," "The Wrath of God," and "The Meaning of *ἑλαστήριον*," especially pp. 35-36.

<sup>5</sup>Stauffer, op. cit., p. 291, f.n. 465: "*ἑλαστήριον* . . . So the roots of our idea are not in hellenism. We must look for them in the LXX."

century, after the time of Paul and John, while "primitive Christianity is both prehellenistic and antihellenistic."<sup>1</sup>

Rudolf Bultmann also sees in this passage of Scripture "a traditional statement, which perhaps can be traced back to the earliest Church."<sup>2</sup> In regard to the relative influence of Hebraic and Hellenistic thought on Paul, Dom Gregory Dix has well observed:

With all his passionate sense of a mission to the Gentiles, his (Paul's) epistles reveal that he always remained unmistakably a Jew talking to Greeks<sup>3</sup> about a Jewish "gospel," from purely Jewish assumptions.

Yet in the discussion of the Hebraic and Hellenistic elements in the Pauline conception of propitiation, it is important that we do not attempt to explain all of Paul's thought only in terms of these two backgrounds. As we have seen repeatedly in our study of this crucial passage in Romans, not only does Paul differ from Hellenic thought but he differs or goes far beyond Hebraic thought. There is a third element, the determining element, the gospel of Jesus Christ. Again Dix

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 107. Regarding the hellenization of Christianity, Stauffer remarks: "But when did the much discussed 'hellenization' of Christianity take place? Harnack looked for its beginnings in the second century, Bousset in pre-Pauline times at Antioch. Harnack has proved to be right. That at any rate has been the outcome of Catholic research in recent decades: Catholicism developed as a synthesis of Christianity and hellenism. But primitive Christianity is both prehellenistic and antihellenistic."

<sup>2</sup>Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 46. And on p. 298, where Bultmann discusses Paul's concept of Christ's death in relation to the mystery religions, he makes no reference to propitiation or this passage in Romans.

<sup>3</sup>Dom Gregory Dix, Jew and Greek. A Study in the Primitive Church (Westminster: Dacre Press: A. and C. Black, Ltd., 1953), p. 32.



has well observed:

What we have to remember is that there were not two forces at work in the mind of the sub-Apostolic Church, Hellenism and Judaism, but three. There was also "the Gospel."<sup>1</sup>

However, as regards the Hebraic and Hellenistic elements in the Pauline conception of propitiation, six points may be noted.

1. The Wrath of God. The wrath of God is taken seriously and personally in Hebraic, Hellenistic, and Pauline thought.<sup>2</sup> Hellenistic thought viewed the wrath of God as often manifested without cause or because of jealousy or some other ignoble motive on the part of the gods. Hebraic thought viewed the wrath of God as his holy reaction to sin, and so does Paul. Paul in fact considers the manifestation of God's wrath against sin as necessary if he is to be righteous. He feels that since in times past some sins have been passed over, Christ is given by God as a means of propitiation to enable us to avoid the wrath of God and yet show God to be righteous.

2. The Use of δικαίω and Cognates. As for the verb,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 111. See also pp. 3-4: "S. Paul recognizes the double relationship fully, but insists the Church is the product of neither, nor yet a fusion between them. Though it emerges out of Judaism, the Church is a new thing, ἐν Χριστῷ ἡ ἐκκλησία." Speaking strictly historically, we must say that he is entirely right. If you attempt to explain the explosion (for it was nothing less) of the Christian Church into history in terms only of 'Hellenism' and 'Judaism' and of any combination between them, while ignoring Jesus of Nazareth, you have missed the chief point."

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 205-206, 235-239.

Schrenk has shown that only in the Septuagint and the New Testament is it used of justifying a person. It is God who justifies and deems righteous. This dynamic aspect of God, justifying a person, is absent in Hellenistic thought.<sup>1</sup>

Yet, a second contrast is offered between Pauline and Hebraic thought on the one hand and Hellenistic thought on the other when "righteousness" as an attribute of God is considered. The Hellenistic gods were often far from righteous, while the holiness and righteousness of God are of prime concern to Paul and the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup>

3. The Use of ἐλαστήριον.<sup>3</sup> It probably has the usage, "a means of propitiation," as it has in the Septuagint, in IV Maccabees, and in secular Greek with the single exception of Philo. However, the fact that many scholars have attempted to give the word the usage of "mercy seat" in Romans based on the usage of ἐλαστήριον in the Septuagint shows that they sensed it was rooted in Hebraic thought rather than Hellenistic.

And even though linguistic evidence combined with the thought of averting the wrath of God causes the translation "a means of propitiation" to be preferred, this cannot be equated with "a means of appeasement," as could be done in some Hellenistic usage. The great difference in ἐλαστήριον for Paul as contrasted with Hellenistic thought is that it is

---

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 202-204, 221-222.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 221-222.

<sup>3</sup>See pp. 222-239.

God himself who has provided it. This leads into point 4.

4. The Initiative of God.<sup>1</sup> God has taken the initiative. We are justified by his grace. It is a gift. God has set forth Christ as our redemption, as a means of propitiation. Here Pauline thought stands in the sharpest contrast to Hellenistic ideas; and though Pauline thought is in harmony with Hebraic thought at this point, it cannot be identified with it, for Paul has gone beyond Hebraic thought.<sup>2</sup>

5. The Idea of Faith. Here Paul differs from both Hebraic and Hellenistic thought. To be sure the Jew had some faith that in obeying the law on the Day of Atonement with the ceremonies centered around the  $\text{תִּפְלֵי־זָבַח}$ , atonement was in some way made for him. To be sure the Greek at least hoped that his sacrifices would help appease the gods. But in neither Hebraic nor Hellenistic thought is the "means of propitiation" so closely tied to and made dependent upon faith as it is in Paul. Moreover, the faith for Paul is not to be equated either with the credulous attitude of the Greeks toward magic or with the faithfulness of the Jews to the law that ended in legalism.<sup>3</sup>

6. The Idea of Blood. Strachan, Metzger, and others have shown that the willing death of Christ stands in sharp contrast to the death of the Hellenistic gods, dying by compulsion, often with bitterness.

---

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 207-211.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 209-211.

<sup>3</sup>See pp. 217-218.



Again there is kinship but no identity between Pauline and Hebraic ideas. While there was no willingness involved on the parts of the animals sacrificed for people's sins, this element of voluntary propitiatory suffering and shedding of blood is seen in IV Maccabees. Moreover, in the Suffering Servant passages in Isaiah, God's initiative and redeeming purpose for the people are both seen in the voluntary suffering of the Servant.

Moreover, this aspect of Hebraic thought, that of the Suffering Servant, had considerable influence on Paul, but it was the mountain peak, not the level plain of Hebraic thought.

The fact that Paul realized the Christian conception of the blood of Christ, shed on the cross, was different from the usual thought of both Jew and Greek is clearly seen in I Cor. 1:23-24: "but we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling-block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

### C. Johannine Doctrine

#### 1. Introduction

The term "Johannine literature" is taken to indicate the various writings in the New Testament associated with the name John, namely, the Gospel of John, the Three Epistles<sup>1</sup> of John, and the Revelation of John. While it is agreed by

---

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St. John, with Introduction, Notes, and

most scholars that the Revelation of John is not by the same author who wrote the Gospel and Epistles that bear the name of John,<sup>1</sup> yet there are sufficient "similarities in language as in thought"<sup>2</sup> between the Gospel and the Apocalypse to "point to some contact between the two writers."<sup>3</sup> As far as the Revelation is concerned, scholars in general agree that the Jewish Christian who wrote this work drew heavily upon Hebraic thought and very little indeed upon Hellenistic thought.<sup>4</sup>

---

Indices, also the Greek Text and English Translation, in The International Critical Commentary, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950). Here the term "Johannine Writings" is used to indicate all this body of literature although unity of authorship is not advocated. See I, xxix-1.

Also F. C. Grant, "Johannine Problem," p. 398 in An Encyclopedia of Religion, ed. by Vergilius Ferm (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945), notes that the Johannine problem deals with the Gospel and Epistles and Revelation that bear the name of John.

<sup>1</sup>J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, in The Interpreter's Critical Commentary, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), I, lxiv-lxviii; also Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John in the ICC, I, xxix ff.

<sup>2</sup>Bernard, op. cit., I, lxvii.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. lxviii. So also Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John in the ICC, I, xxxii-xxxiv. The fact that Charles and Bernard do not agree as to who was the author of the Apocalypse perhaps gives added weight to their agreement that the author of Revelation was different from but connected with the author of the Gospel and the Epistles.

<sup>4</sup>Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, in the ICC, II, 473, lists Hebraisms used in the Apocalypse. I, lxx-lxxxiii, lists passages based on the OT or Pseudopigrapha. For additional Hebraisms and a discussion of the Hebraic style used, see I, cxlii-clii. Of two instances where the author might have been acquainted with Greek thought, regarding Rev. 12:1-5, 13-17, Charles concludes (v. 1, pp. 310-314) that the basis is a primitive international myth which may have been adopted and adapted by a Pharisaic Jew prior to the time of the composition of

If not the author himself, at least the authority behind the Gospel of John was a Palestinian Jew.<sup>1</sup> And a study of the Dead Sea Scrolls has reinforced the view "that we do not have to look outside of Palestinian Judaism for the soil in which the Johannine theology grew."<sup>2</sup> This is important since most scholars agree that the author of the Gospel of John is also the author of the First Epistle of John.<sup>3</sup>

Those who contend for separate authorship, such as C. H. Dodd, admit that "the author of the Epistle was a disciple of the Evangelist and a student of his work."<sup>4</sup> Now since the

---

Revelation. Regarding the second instance in Rev. 21:18 ff., Charles concludes that the author was acquainted with contemporary astronomy and deliberately deviated from it. See I, clxxxvi and II, 165-169.

<sup>1</sup>Wilbert F. Howard, "The Gospel According to St. John, Introduction and Exegesis," pp. 437-811 in the IB, VIII, 440 f.

See also Bernard, op. cit., I, lxviii-lxxi.

<sup>2</sup>Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 339-340. See also Ch. III, especially the conclusion, pp. 150-152, of this study.

See also "Out of the Desert," Time, The Weekly News-magazine, Vol. LXIX, No. 14, April 15, 1957, p. 68: "The parallels and similarities are (between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of John), in fact, so numerous and conclusive that they seriously challenge the theory that the Gospel of John was the latest to be written and that it shows marked Greek influence. Instead, many modern scholars now view John as thoroughly Jewish and his Gospel perhaps the earliest of the four."

<sup>3</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, The Gospel of John in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, edited by James Moffatt (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1928), p. 11.

Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, in the ICC, I, xxxiv-xxxvii.

Bernard, op. cit., I, lx-lxiv. Other scholars are cited on p. lx.

A. E. Brooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles, in the ICC, pp. 1-xi.

Of more recent date see F. V. Filson, Opening the New Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952), p. 207, and Howard, op. cit., pp. 461-462.

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. lvi.



Johannine doctrine of propitiation finds its classic expression in the First Epistle of John, it is interesting that Dodd lists as one reason for maintaining separate authorship that "there are various points, and those by no means unimportant, where the Epistle represents a theological outlook nearer than that of the Gospel to primitive or popular Christianity."<sup>1</sup> While Dodd maintains that at points the Hellenistic element has freer play in the Epistle than in the Gospel,<sup>2</sup> he points out that in so far as the doctrine of the atonement is concerned, the Epistle is more closely related to primitive Christianity than the Gospel:

The statements made in the Epistle about the redemptive efficacy of the death of Christ scarcely go beyond the terms of the primitive apostolic Preaching. Only one technical term of theology is used, the word which should be translated "expiation" (ii 2, iv. 10; see notes, pp. 25-7). This term, which is little more than an index to the doctrine of the Suffering Servant of the Lord in the prophecy of the Second Isaiah, is avoided in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>3</sup>

The reference of Dodd to the one technical term is noteworthy. Though both the Revelation and the Gospel mention the wrath of God,<sup>4</sup> the sin of man,<sup>5</sup> the removal of this sin

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. liii.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. lii. For an examination and reply to all of Dodd's arguments for separate authorship, see Howard, op. cit., pp. 461-462.

See also Robert Law, The Tests of Life, A Study of the First Epistle of St. John (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), pp. 2-4, for consideration of the Hebraic element in the First Epistle.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. liv.

<sup>4</sup>John 3:36; Rev. 19:15. See also Rev. 11:18; 14:10, 19; 15:1, 7; 16:1, 19; and also 6:16, where the wrath of the Lamb is mentioned. And see too John 5:29 and 12:48, where the last judgment is indicated as a threat to evil doers and unbelievers.

<sup>5</sup>John 8:34; 9:41; 15:22 ff.; 19:11; I John 1:8-10; 2:1; 3:4-9; Rev. 18:4-5.

through Christ,<sup>1</sup> and the state of fellowship that we may enjoy with God through Christ,<sup>2</sup> it is on I John with the technical word and the primitive doctrine that the investigation will be centered. In I John, in ἱλασμός, is the key to the Johannine conception of propitiation.

## 2. ἱλασμός

The examination of ἱλασμός in both the Greek Old Testament and in secular Greek has shown that it has a wide variety of usages.<sup>3</sup> In the Septuagint it has the usage of "atonement" in general as it identifies the ram of atonement or the day of atonement. It designates the sin offering. While it probably has the usage of "means or instrument of propitiation," it has the usage of "forgiveness" in one instance (Ps. 130:4).<sup>4</sup> In its one appearance in the inter-testamental religious writings of the Jews, ἱλασμός has the usage of "instrument of propitiation,"<sup>5</sup> but in secular Greek a wide variety of usages is found. At times it has the usage of "propitiation," "appeasement," "expiation," "absolvement," "atonement," and on one occasion in Philo it approaches the usage of "means of forgiveness." When it is

---

<sup>1</sup>John 1:29; 8:24; I John 1:7-2:2; 3:5, 16; 4:10; Rev. 1:5.

<sup>2</sup>John 1:12-13; 6:35-59; 8:19; 12:26; 14:1-9; 20-21; 16:27; 17:24-26; I John 1:3; 2:23-25; 4:9-10, 15; 5:1; Rev. 1:5-6; 7:13-17; 12:10-11; 21:22-27.

<sup>3</sup>See pp. 52-53 and 177-178.

It appears only once in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. See pp. 108-110.

<sup>4</sup>See pp. 50-51.

<sup>5</sup>See pp. 108-110.

considered that *ἱλασμός* is not a very common word in either the Septuagint or in non-Biblical Greek, this wide variety of usages forbids one to come to I John with an exact definition of *ἱλασμός*, ready to insert at 2:2 and 4:10. Indeed, since it is used with more than one shade of usage in the few times it appears in both Plutarch and Philo, it is not inconceivable that it bears a shade of usage in 4:10 different from that in 2:2. While the only certain thing about the word is that it refers in some way to "atonement," it has the usage "forgiveness" only in the Septuagint, and it approaches "a means of forgiveness" only in the Jewish writer Philo in non-Biblical Greek.

a. I John 2:2

The Greek sentence in which *ἱλασμός* appears begins at I John 2:2b and reads: καὶ ἂν τις ἁμάρτη, παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον· καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὗ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου.<sup>1</sup>

Some attention should be given to the word *παράκλητος*. Phillips, Moffatt, the Authorized Version, and the Revised Standard Version all render the word into English with "advocate." When we sin, Jesus Christ is our advocate with God or before God.<sup>2</sup> The term indicates, as Dodd recognizes,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, in loc.

<sup>2</sup>See Johannes Behm, *TWNT*, V, 802, f.n. 27, where the idea that he is God or Christ's advocate before men is rejected.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 94-95.



that Christ intercedes for us so that God will not deal with us as he otherwise would when we sin. The idea of avoiding the just wrath of God is implied though not stated, and the thought involves that of propitiation.

Yet there is no kinship with the Hellenistic idea of Christ's appeasing God, since God in his prevenient grace has provided his son and sent his son (I John 4:9, 14) for the purpose of saving mankind.

Scholars are by no means agreed as to what usage best renders *ἱλασμός* into English. The suggestion easiest to reject is that of Maurice, to whom it signifies "mercy seat."<sup>1</sup>

Phillips translates as though *ἱλασμός* were a verbal form: "the One Who made personal atonement." Here *ἱλασμός*, all the more since it does not have a definite article, may be best taken in the general sense of atonement, yet Phillips at this point seems to be interpreting rather than merely translating.<sup>2</sup>

The Authorized Version reads "the propitiation."<sup>3</sup> And

---

<sup>1</sup>Frederick Denison Maurice, The Epistles of St. John, A Series of Lectures on Christian Ethics (London: Macmillan and Co., 1867), pp. 62-68. *ἱλασμός* is never used to render *כִּפּוּר* in the LXX. It is never used for "mercy seat" in Hellenistic Greek. Since the mercy seat had been destroyed long before the time of John and since only the High Priest would enter the Holy of Holies in any event, his assertion (pp. 64-65) that John had gazed on this mercy seat is inaccurate.

<sup>2</sup>Of course some interpretation is latent in any translation.

<sup>3</sup>Moffatt also translates: "the propitiation."

while "propitiation" has been proposed by several scholars as the translation of the word, Robert Law is right in objecting to the "the." "The absence of the article with ἱλασμός brings out the qualitative or generic force of the word. The thought is not that Christ is the propitiation for our sins (to the exclusion of all others), but that God's Love was so great that He sent His Son as a propitiation for sin."<sup>1</sup> Moreover, while Law repeatedly speaks of propitiation, when he explains the usage of ἱλασμός more explicitly, it is in terms of a sin offering or of expiation. After quoting from Driver that propitiation in the Old Testament is effected "especially (but not exclusively) by the sin-offering," he adds:

Such is the word and such is the conception employed in the Epistle to express the mode of action by which Christ has accomplished and still accomplishes His mission as the Saviour of the world.<sup>2</sup>

But Law is even clearer that the action of ἱλασμός is to expiate:

And, beyond dispute, ἱλασμός can mean but one thing . . . that which in some way (we may not be able to say, and I do not here attempt to say, in what way or upon what principle) expiates the guilt of sin, which restores sinful offenders to God by rendering their sin null and inoperative as a barrier to fellowship with him.<sup>3</sup>

A. E. Brooks,<sup>4</sup> Erich Haupt,<sup>5</sup> and Brooke Foss

---

<sup>1</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 398. The definite article is missing in both 2:2 and 4:10.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 161-162.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>4</sup>Brooke, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

<sup>5</sup>Erich Haupt, The First Epistle of St. John, A Contribution to Biblical Theology, translated with an introduction by W. B. Pope (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879). Haupt combines the concept of expiation with that of sacrifice, p. 60: "In

Westcott<sup>1</sup> are others who speak of propitiation but seem to mean expiation.

Morris contends that on the basis of the word "advocate" the idea of propitiation is implied, and it is.<sup>2</sup> Yet on the basis of 1:7, where we read "the blood of Jesus his son cleanses us from all sin," the idea is that of expiation. Again in 1:9 the ideas of cleansing and free forgiveness are both found: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, and will forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

Morris asks:

Why should sin be expiated? What will be the consequences if there is no expiation? Expiation would seem to be a meaningless procedure unless there is some such reality as the wrath of God to be reckoned with.<sup>3</sup>

Morris is again correct. Yet the question is as to what John primarily has in mind, the removal of sin or avoiding the wrath of God. No doubt the two are related. However, as in Romans, where both thoughts, expiation and propitiation,

---

accordance with this, the *ἱλασμός* is the expiation, inasmuch as it was wrought and perfected by our great High Priest on the New Testament day of atonement by the sacrifice of Himself."

And again on p. 61: "Here we may perceive the right answer to the question why Christ is here termed not *ἱλαστήρ* but *ἱλασμός*. For this reason, namely because it was not the object to lay stress upon the fact that He was the true High Priest, but that He was that true high-priestly offering in virtue of which sin is expiated. Moreover, the construction of *ἱλασμός* with *περί* is in strict correspondence with the Hebrew, where *בְּ* or *עַל* is used with the meaning *de* or concerning."

<sup>1</sup>Brooke Foss Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup>Morris, "The Use of *ἱλάσκεσθαι*," p. 233.

<sup>3</sup>Morris, "The Wrath of God," p. 145.



are present and related, the primary emphasis, as conditioned by the previous discussion Paul had given of the wrath of God, is felt to be that the ἱλαστήριον was upon our changed relationship to God and consequently to be rendered by "a means of propitiation"; so in John, while both the thoughts of expiation and propitiation are present and related, the primary emphasis is felt to be upon the removal of sins, and ἱλασμός is consequently better understood as "a means of expiation."<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, the usage of ἱλαστήριον already established, especially in IV Maccabees, indicated "a means of propitiation" as the preferred usage of ἱλαστήριον, even if all other things were equal. In the case of ἱλασμός, comment has already been made on the wider range of usage it has outside of I John, including forgiveness.

The expiatory function of Christ in Johannine thought is well stated by Walter Grundmann:

Christ's victory over sin, as presented in the earlier Gospels, meets us again in John's kerygma, with the unfolding of its meaning. The keynote is struck in I John iii, 5: "He was manifested to take away sins, and in him is no sin." The Christ takes sin upon himself and removes it. The primary reference is to his death, and the defeat of sin is pictured in terms drawn from the Jewish sacrificial system. This is implied in the quotation above, and appears again at John i, 29; I John ii, 2; iv, 10; i, 7. Christ defeats the world as the expiator who makes atonement.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wrath, or ὀργή, is mentioned in Rom. 1:18, 2:5, 8; and 3:5 prior to ἱλαστήριον in 3:25, but the term does not appear at all in I John. Yet in I John, forms of the verb ἁμαρτάνω appear some nine times (1:10; 2:1(2x); 3:6, 8, 9; 5:16(2x), 18, and forms of the noun ἁμαρτία appear some 14 times (1:7, 8, 9(2x); 2:2, 12; 3:4, 5, 8, 9; 4:10; 5:16(2x), 17).

<sup>2</sup>Walter Grundmann, "Sin in the New Testament," pp. 64-89 in Quell, Bertram, Stählin, and Grundmann, Sin, pp. 71-72.

Not only does ἱλασμός primarily convey the idea of expiation, but some scholars also noting the importance of the sacrificial concept with John, have translated ἱλασμός to convey this concept. Goodspeed translates ἱλασμός with "an atoning sacrifice." Dodd uses the concept "sin-offering" to explain ἱλασμός,<sup>1</sup> though he uses the term "expiation" also.<sup>2</sup> Rienecker also uses the term "Opfersühne" to explain ἱλασμός, but gives "Sühnung" as first choice for the rendering of the term into German.<sup>3</sup>

While John does mention the blood of Christ as cleansing from sin elsewhere in I John and while ἱλασμός indicates the sin-offering in Eze. 44:27, since neither the blood nor the death of Christ is mentioned in this passage, it is probably better to render the term more generally as "an expiation" or "a means of expiation."

Büchsel rightly observes:

Wodurch Jesus den ἱλασμός vollbracht hat, ist von Joh nicht ausgeführt. Doch verdient Beachtung, dass er weder 2, 2 noch 4, 10 vom Sterben Jesu redet, sondern nur von dem Auferstandenen (2, 1 πρὸς τὸν πατέρα) und von der Gesamtendung Jesu 4, 10. Der ἱλασμός hängt nicht einseitig an der Einzelleistung des Sterbens, sondern an dem Ganzen der Sendung und der Person Jesu, zu dem freilich sein Sterben unablässig hinzugehört 5, 6 vgl 3, 16; 1, 7. Als der, der den Zweck seiner Sendung erfüllt hat, der in vollendeter Liebe 3, 17 Bewährte, als der Gerechte 2, 2 ist Jesus die Sühne.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup>Fritz Rienecker, Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament nach der Ausgabe von D. Eberhard Nestle, 8. Auflage (Gießen-Basel: Brunnen-Verlag, 1952), p. 596.

<sup>4</sup>Büchsel, TWNT, III, 318, lines 32-39.

ἑλασμός is considered to have the usage of "expiation" by Vincent Taylor<sup>1</sup> and also by the translators of the Revised Standard Version, though both Taylor and the Revised Standard Version render I John 2:2 in part: "and he is the expiation for our sins."<sup>2</sup> While it is agreed that "expiation" is the best word with which to render ἑλασμός in I John 2:2 into English, and while it is agreed that the author considered Christ to be the supreme and unique expiation the Father had provided, yet the Greek indicates that an indefinite article would be more in order so that the translation would read: "and he is an expiation for our sins."<sup>3</sup>

b. I John 4:10

This verse, which contains the only other instance of ἑλασμός in the New Testament and the only other instance of any ἐλάσκεσθαι word in the Johannine literature, is I John 4:10, in which the Greek text reads: ἐν τούτῳ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήκαμεν τὸν θεόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐλασμόν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.<sup>4</sup>

Most of the reasons for believing that the usage of

---

<sup>1</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching (London: The Epworth Press, 1950), pp. 135-161.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 150, and the RSV, in loc.

<sup>3</sup>Law, op. cit., p. 398.

Brooke, op. cit., p. 28.

Goodspeed in his translation also uses the indefinite article.

<sup>4</sup>Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, in loc.



*ἑλασμός* is that of "expiation" in 2:2 are valid in this instance also. There are, moreover, additional reasons which insist upon "expiation" rather than "propitiation" as the word best fitted to express the usage of *ἑλασμός* in this instance.

First, the word "advocate" and such related thoughts as it may present are not present in this verse.

Second, the attitude of God toward us, even prior to the coming of Christ, is not said to be one of wrath; on the contrary, it is one of love.

Regarding this point, and suggesting the rendering "propitiation," Leon Morris has said:

Concerning the use of the term in I Jn. 4:10 there is but one observation we would wish to make, namely, that if *ἑλασμός* be given its usual meaning we have here one of those resounding paradoxes which mean so much for an understanding of the New Testament, whereas if the more colourless meaning "expiation" is understood the verse is much less striking.<sup>1</sup>

Aside from objecting that "propitiation" may be the more usual meaning of *ἑλασμός* in Hellenistic Greek but not in the Septuagint,<sup>2</sup> Morris is correct that "propitiation" would result in a more paradoxical statement than "expiation." And we have only to compare I John 1:8-10 with I John 3:9 to know that, with John, such a paradoxical statement is possible. When, however, the prior usage of *ἑλασμός* does not demand the usage of "propitiation" and when the context strongly

---

<sup>1</sup>Morris, "The Use of *ἐλάσκεσθαι*," p. 233.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 48-53 for a discussion of *ἑλασμός* in the LXX and pp. 174-178 for a discussion of secular Greek, while pp. 108-110 discuss its one appearance in intertestamental literature.

suggests another usage, there seems little point in using incongruous terms unnecessarily, merely to create our own paradoxes.

There is no hint that the purpose of the *ἔλασμός* is primarily to change God's attitude toward us. The *ἔλασμός* does not win God's love but is the fruit of his love.<sup>1</sup>

Not only does the idea of the unmerited love of God show Johannine thought to be in sharp contrast with the bulk of Hellenistic thought; it also shows it as standing in contrast with the doctrine of propitiation as connected with *ἔλασμός* in II Maccabees.<sup>2</sup> The initiative of God, not of man, could not be more clearly stated than "he loved us and sent his Son."

Not only has God taken the initiative in the expiating process, as he did in the Old Testament with the establishment of the ceremonial law, but he has provided the expiation. As with Paul, John here takes the divine initiative a step further than the Old Testament. The depths of this divine love are shown, as well as the seriousness of sin implied, by the fact that God sent not an ox or a ram but his Son. The Son, moreover, did not merely make expiation for us; he was sent to be an expiation for our sins.

It should also be observed that there is an ethical note present that was often missing in Hellenistic thoughts of

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Rienecker, *op. cit.*, p. 596.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 108-110.

propitiation. The result of this gracious act of love on God's part toward us is that we should love one another.<sup>1</sup> The thought is not that God has been moved to expiate our sins by rites, prayers, or good works, but that we should be moved to action and love one another because God, of his own love, sent his son to be an expiation for our sins.

### 3. Conclusions

In the introduction to Johannine thought<sup>2</sup> we have seen that the author was probably a Palestinian Jew<sup>3</sup> and that most aspects of his thought which were formerly attributed to Hellenistic influence have been revealed by the Dead Sea Scrolls to have been present in Judaism prior to the time of John.<sup>4</sup> Of the various Johannine doctrines, the doctrine of propitiation as presented in I John is agreed to be the one most firmly rooted in primitive Christian thought and with allusions to the Suffering Servant.<sup>5</sup>

Yet if Hebraic thought is present and Hellenistic thought neglected or in fact opposed, the Johannine doctrine of propitiation, or more properly "expiation," is still not to be thought of as a straight line development of Hebraic

---

<sup>1</sup>An ethical idea, though perhaps not so prominent, is also present in Paul's use of *ἐλαστήριον*. Paul observes that in view of God's having set forth Christ as a means of propitiation, "Then what becomes of our boasting? It is excluded" (Rom. 3:27).

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 244-248.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 247. See especially Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. liv.



thought apart from the impact of Jesus Christ. Referring to Johannine literature, Dix well observes: "The full power of 'the Gospel' to be neither Jewish nor Greek, still less a fusion of both, but itself, is finally displayed."<sup>1</sup>

The conclusion that the Johannine doctrine of propitiation has little in common with Hellenistic thought and usually stands in contrast with it while at the same time having points in common with Hebraic thought, but still different from it, can be seen by an examination of the doctrine at several points.

In contrast with the love of God, the gods of Greek mythology could be spiteful and jealous toward men, and when a god was especially kind to a person, it was often a fickle friendship. Nowhere do the gods in general have a self-sacrificing love which extends to all men, even the whole world.

There is a kinship between the love of God as set forth in Johannine literature and certain passages in the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> God's love on occasion is presented as a suffering love,<sup>3</sup> yet though there is a tendency in some of the prophetic books toward universalism, it is never quite reached.<sup>4</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup>Dix, op. cit., p. 90. See also pp. 14, 88-90, in Dix.

<sup>2</sup>Gottfried Quell in Gottfried Quell and Ethelbert Stauffer, in Love in Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, translated by J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, Ltd., 1949), pp. 1-24. See especially pp. 15-24 for a discussion of God's love in the Old Testament.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 19-21.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

tendency which is found here and there in the Old Testament to make God's love dependent upon good works came to fruition in much of later Judaism.<sup>1</sup> Quell rightly observes that:

There can be no doubt that the Covenant is an expression in juridical language of the experience of God's love: the whole Covenant theory is based on the idea of love.<sup>2</sup>

But when this has been said, it must also be said that juridical language is not nearly so adequate or powerful to express love as the kind of language we find in John 3:16; I John 4:9-10. Indeed, forms of ἀγάπη and ἀγαπάω appear 43 times in the Gospel of John and 46 times in I John. While the love of God is spoken of throughout the Bible, only in I John do we read: "God is love."<sup>3</sup>

The Johannine doctrine of propitiation is grounded in the love of God and extends to all the world in a way that is utterly different from, if not opposed to, Hellenistic conceptions of propitiation and while akin to the Old Testament thought, goes far beyond it.

In regard to the idea of the initiative of God, Johannine thought is very similar to Pauline. Paul says God put forward (προέθετο) Jesus Christ as a means of propitiation while John says God sent (ἀπέστειλεν) his Son to be an expiation for our sins. At this point Pauline thought and Johannine thought not only stand in opposition to Hellenistic thought, but, though having common ground with Hebraic thought, have

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 22. See Deut. 7:13.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>I John 4:8, 16.

surpassed Hebraic thought in stressing the initiative of God.<sup>1</sup> God here has not only taken the initiative, but has provided a means of expiation, even his Son, Jesus Christ.

The wrath of God is noticeable in I John by the fact that it is not mentioned. Johannine thought stands in sharp contrast here with not only Hellenistic thought but also that of the Old Testament and even that of Paul. It cannot be said that the idea of the wrath of God is not present in Johannine thought or literature, but it is deemphasized while the love of God is emphasized. As regards propitiation or expiation, the love of God is not obtained because of it but is the basis of the propitiation or expiation.

This is not to say that Johannine thought does not take sin seriously: it does. Here again Johannine thought is opposed to Hellenistic thought,<sup>2</sup> which conceived of sin in a number of ways but not with the same moral seriousness of Johannine thought.<sup>3</sup> In one way, it can be said that Pauline and Johannine thought conceive of sin even more seriously than even the Old Testament and Hebraic thought. Sin is such

---

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 209-211 for a discussion of Pauline thought on this point.

<sup>2</sup>Gustav Stählin and Walter Grundmann, in Quell, Bertram, Stählin, and Grundmann, Sin, pp. 53-73.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 53: "The Christian idea of sin is not found in classical Greek literature, which knows nothing of the hostility to God that excludes what is right from thought and will."

Pp. 62-73: "When a man despises his god, he is not revealing an existential characteristic of human nature; he is simply committing one of the offences already mentioned; no proper consciousness of sin is indicated."



a serious matter that God is viewed as sending more than a sacrificial system, more than a prophet, but even his only begotten Son to do away with it. The Son, moreover, is not thought of so much as making expiation as being an expiation for our sins--even those of the whole world.

In regard to the ethical quality in expiation or propitiation, Johannine thought is again to be distinguished from Hellenistic thought. In Hellenistic religious thought the means of propitiation were sometimes anything but moral or ethical, and the ethical behaviour of the worshipper often had little to do with the belief that the gods were angry with him and needed to be propitiated. Even at best, however, man did something which was supposed to make a god or goddess more favorable to him. With John, God out of his unmerited love has done something for us, and realizing this, we should develop a more kindly attitude toward our neighbor.<sup>1</sup>

This same ethical quality, to be sure, is to be found also in the Pauline conception of propitiation<sup>2</sup> and in some portions of the Old Testament,<sup>3</sup> but nowhere is the motive for our love toward one another more firmly rooted in the preventive love of God than in I John 4:10-11:

---

<sup>1</sup>I John 4:10-11.

<sup>2</sup>Rom. 3:27.

<sup>3</sup>Perhaps Deut. 24:17-22 is the clearest exhortation to ethical and generous conduct toward other people with the primary reason being that God has redeemed Israel.

"In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be an expiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This is the translation of the RSV except that "the" before "expiation" has been replaced with "an."

# APPENDIX I

## CORRELATION OF VARIOUS GREEK WORDS IN THE LXX WITH HEBREW TERMS<sup>1</sup>

### A. ἐξιλάσκειν

1. Genesis	32:20	אָכַפֶּרָה
2. Exodus	30:10	וְכִפֶּר
3. Exodus	30:15	לְכִפֶּר
4. Exodus	30:16	לְכִפֶּר
5. Exodus	32:30	אָכַפֶּרָה <sup>2</sup>
6. Leviticus	1:4	לְכִפֶּר
7. Leviticus	4:20	וְכִפֶּר
8. Leviticus	4:26	וְכִפֶּר
9. Leviticus	4:31	וְכִפֶּר
10. Leviticus	4:35	וְכִפֶּר
11. Leviticus	5:6	וְכִפֶּר
12. Leviticus	5:10	וְכִפֶּר
13. Leviticus	5:13	וְכִפֶּר
14. Leviticus	5:16	וְכִפֶּר
15. Leviticus	5:18	וְכִפֶּר
16. Leviticus	5:26	וְכִפֶּר
17. Leviticus	6:23	לְכִפֶּר

<sup>1</sup>Hatch and Redpath, *op. cit.*, is the basis on which this Appendix has been prepared.

<sup>2</sup>Pentateuchi textus hebræo-samaritanus = אָכַפֶּרָה.



18.	Leviticus	7:7	יִכְפֹּר-בוֹ
19.	Leviticus	8:15	לְכַפֵּר
20.	Leviticus	8:34	לְכַפֵּר
21.	Leviticus	9:7	וְכַפֵּר
22.	Leviticus	9:7	וְכַפֵּר
23.	Leviticus	10:17	לְכַפֵּר
24.	Leviticus	12:7	וְכַפֵּר
25.	Leviticus	12:8	וְכַפֵּר
26.	Leviticus	14:8	וְכַפֵּר
27.	Leviticus	14:19	וְכַפֵּר
28.	Leviticus	14:20	וְכַפֵּר
29.	Leviticus	14:21	לְכַפֵּר
30.	Leviticus	14:29	לְכַפֵּר
31.	Leviticus	14:31	וְכַפֵּר
32.	Leviticus	14:53	וְכַפֵּר
33.	Leviticus	15:15	וְכַפֵּר
34.	Leviticus	15:30	וְכַפֵּר
35.	Leviticus	16:6	וְכַפֵּר
36.	Leviticus	16:10 <sup>1</sup>	לְכַפֵּר
37.	Leviticus	16:11	וְכַפֵּר
38.	Leviticus	16:16	וְכַפֵּר
39.	Leviticus	16:17	לְכַפֵּר
40.	Leviticus	16:17	וְכַפֵּר
41.	Leviticus	16:18	וְכַפֵּר

<sup>1</sup>Quell, in loc., in Kittel's Biblia Hebraica; Driver in "Propitiation," IV, 130, of DBT, and Herrmann in TWNT, III, 309, footnote 27; all question the genuineness of this instance. Koehler, in KBL, p. 451, apparently omits this instance.

42.	Leviticus	16:20	חֲכָר
43.	Leviticus	16:24	וְכָר
44.	Leviticus	16:27	לְכָר
45.	Leviticus	16:30 <sup>1</sup>	יְכָר
46.	Leviticus	16:32 <sup>2</sup>	וְכָר
47.	Leviticus	16:33	וְכָר
48.	Leviticus	16:33	יְכָר
49.	Leviticus	16:33	יְכָר
50.	Leviticus	16:34	לְכָר
51.	Leviticus	17:11	לְכָר
52.	Leviticus	17:11	יְכָר
53.	Leviticus	19:22	וְכָר
54.	Leviticus	23:28	לְכָר
55.	Numbers	5:8	יְכָר-בו
56.	Numbers	6:11	וְכָר
57.	Numbers	8:12	לְכָר
58.	Numbers	8:19	וְלְכָר
59.	Numbers	8:21	וְיְכָר
60.	Numbers	15:25	וְכָר
61.	Numbers	15:28	וְכָר
62.	Numbers	15:28	לְכָר
63.	Numbers	17:11 (EV 16:46)	וְכָר
64.	Numbers	17:12 (EV 16:47)	וְיְכָר

<sup>1</sup>Quell notes in loc., in Kittell's Biblia Hebraica, that perhaps וְיְכָר is to be read.

<sup>2</sup>Pentateuchi textus hebraea-samaritanus and LXX read: וְיְכָר.

65.	Numbers	25:13 <sup>1</sup>	וַיִּכְפֹּר
66.	Numbers	28:22	לְכַפֵּר
67.	Numbers	28:30	לְכַפֵּר
68.	Numbers	29:5	לְכַפֵּר
69.	Numbers	29:11 <sup>2</sup>	-
70.	Numbers	31:50	לְכַפֵּר
71.	Numbers	35:33	לֹא-יִכָּפֹר
72.	Deuteronomy	21:8	וְנִכְפַּר
73.	I Samuel	5:4	יִתְכַּפֵּר
74.	I Samuel	6:3 <sup>3</sup>	-
75.	II Samuel	21:3	אֶכְפֹּר
76.	I Chronicles	6:49	וּלְכַפֵּר
77.	II Chronicles	29:24	וַיִּחַטְּאוּ
78.	II Chronicles	29:24	לְכַפֵּר
79.	II Chronicles	30:18	יִכָּפֹר
80.	Nehemiah	10:33	לְכַפֵּר
81.	Psalms	105:30 (EV 106) <sup>4</sup>	וַיַּעַל

<sup>1</sup>Quell, *in loc.*, in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, comments, "propositum וַיִּכָּפֹר."

<sup>2</sup>This passage deals with various offerings. In the MT and EV they are merely listed in 29:11. The LXX, however, inserts ἐξιλάσασθαι after the mention of the sin offering, apparently to indicate its purpose.

<sup>3</sup>There is no relationship between ἐξιλασθήσεται in the LXX and וַיִּכָּפֹר in the MT. C. H. Dodd, in *The Bible and the Greeks*, p. 88, remarks, "Either the translators are paraphrasing rather than translating or they had a different text." Hatch and Redpath, *op. cit.*, *in loc.*, list וַיִּכָּפֹר as the corresponding term with a question mark.

<sup>4</sup>The LXX does not exactly correspond to the MT since וַיִּכָּפֹר ordinarily has the usage of "intervene" or "interpose." Both the Greek and Hebrew verbs, however, indicate what Phineas did to stop the plague.



82.	Proverbs	16:14	רַב־פֶּרֶן
83.	Sirach	3:3 <sup>1</sup>	-
84.	Sirach	3:30 <sup>2</sup>	תכפר
85.	Sirach	5:6 <sup>3</sup>	יסלח
86.	Sirach	16:7	נשא
87.	Sirach	20:28 <sup>4</sup>	-
88.	Sirach	28:5 <sup>5</sup>	-
89.	Sirach	34:15 <sup>6</sup>	-
90.	Sirach	45:16	ולכפר
91.	Sirach	45:23	ויכפר
92.	Habakkuk	1:11 <sup>7</sup>	-
93.	Zechariah	7:2	לְחַלּוֹת
94.	Zechariah	8:22	וּלְחַלּוֹת
95.	Malachi	1:9	חֲלוּ-נָא
96.	Ezekiel	16:63	בְּכִפְרִי-לִי
97.	Ezekiel	43:20 <sup>8</sup>	וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ אֶת הָאָרֶץ וְכִפַּרְתָּהּ

<sup>1</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.

<sup>2</sup>The Hebrew text used is that published by H. L. Strack, 1903.

<sup>3</sup>In The Bible and the Greeks, Dodd gives רַב־פֶּרֶן as the Hebrew equivalent. And before Hebrew texts were available, Edersheim conjectured רַב־פֶּרֶן was probably the Hebrew equivalent. But both Hebrew texts published by Strack, op. cit., for this portion of the Sirach give יסלח and neither Schechter and Taylor, op. cit., Levi, op. cit., nor Smend, op. cit., makes mention of רַב־פֶּרֶן at this point.

<sup>4</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.

<sup>5</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.

<sup>6</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.

<sup>7</sup>The LXX does not follow the MT at this point, and ἑξίλασεται has no corresponding term in Hebrew.

<sup>8</sup>Bewer's critical notes in Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, in loc., indicate he feels ἑξίλασσονται renders נִשְׂא but not רַב־פֶּרֶן in this instance.

98. Ezekiel	43:22	לְנִפְחָת
99. Ezekiel	43:22	וְנִפְחָתִי
100. Ezekiel	43:26	יְכַפֵּר
101. Ezekiel	45:15	לְכַפֵּר
102. Ezekiel	45:17	לְכַפֵּר
103. Ezekiel	45:18	וְנִפְחָתִי
104. Ezekiel	45:20	וְיִכַּפֵּר
105. Daniel	3:40 <sup>1</sup> (Not in EV)	—

NOTE: *ἐξιλάσκειν* appears 105 times in the LXX, including instances in the Apocrypha. A corresponding Hebrew term is present 97 times, and 87 times a form of כָּפַר is the underlying term or a part of the underlying phrase.

If only the canonical portions of the LXX are considered, forms of *ἐξιλάσκειν* appear 95 times with a corresponding Hebrew term present 93 times with forms of כָּפַר appearing 84 times.

#### B. *ἐξιλάσις*

1. Numbers	29:11	וְיִכַּפֵּר
2. Habakkuk	3:17 <sup>2</sup>	—

#### C. *ἐξιλάσμα*

1. I Samuel	12:3	כָּפַר
2. Psalm	49:7 (LXX 48:7)	וְיִכַּפֵּר

NOTE: Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all also render כָּפַר with *ἐξιλάσμα* in their versions of Ex. 20:12, Pr. 13:8, 21:18, and Am. 5:12. See Appendix III, A.

#### D.

1. Exodus	30:10	
2. Leviticus	23:27 <sup>3</sup>	

<sup>1</sup>Dan. 3:40 has no Hebrew or Aramaic counterpart, and is considered by Protestants as part of the Apocrypha.

<sup>2</sup>There is no Hebrew term corresponding to *ἐξιλάσις* in the MT.

<sup>3</sup>Quell, in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, in loc., points out that *עֲוֹן* is not presupposed in the Pentateuchi textus hebraeo-samaritanus or LXX.

3.	Leviticus	23:28	פִּזְרִים
4.	Numbers	5:8	חֲפִצֵּי
5.	I Chronicles	28:11	חֲפִצֵּי
6.	I Esdras	9:20 <sup>1</sup>	—
7.	The Wisdom of Solomon	18:21 <sup>2</sup>	—
8.	Sirach	5:5 <sup>3</sup>	סְלִיחָה
9.	Sirach	16:11 <sup>4</sup>	וְסוּלָה
10.	Sirach	17:29 <sup>5</sup>	—
11.	Sirach	18:12 <sup>6</sup>	—
12.	Sirach	18:20 <sup>7</sup>	—
13.	Sirach	35:3 <sup>8</sup>	—
14.	Ezekiel	7:25 <sup>9</sup>	—
15.	Ezekiel	43:23	חֲפִצֵּי
16.	Ezekiel	45:19	חֲפִצֵּי
17.	II Maccabees	12:45 <sup>10</sup>	—

NOTE: Of these 17 instances in the LXX, only 8 are to be found in canonical books.

E. ἑλάσκεισθαι

1.	Exodus	32:14	חֲפִצֵּי
2.	II Kings	5:18	חֲפִצֵּי

- <sup>1</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>2</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>3</sup>This is the reading of both manuscripts A and B in H. L. Strack's edition of the Hebrew Text.  
<sup>4</sup>Using Strack's edition of the Hebrew Text.  
<sup>5</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>6</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>7</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>8</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>9</sup>There is no corresponding term in the MT. Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., in loc., lists חֲפִצֵּי as the corresponding term, with a question mark beside it. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all replace ἑλάσκεισθαι by other Greek words.  
<sup>10</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.



3. II Kings	5:18	יָסַח־נָא
4. II Kings	24:4	לִסְלִיחַ
5. II Chronicles	6:30	וְיָסַח־לָּךְ
6. Esther	4:17h <sup>1</sup>	-
7. Psalm	25:(LXX 24):11	וְיָסַח־לָּךְ
8. Psalm	65(LXX 64):3	תִּכְפָּרֶם
9. Psalm	78(LXX 77):38	יִכָּפֶר
10. Psalm	79(LXX 78):9	וְיִכָּפֶר
11. Lamentations	8:42	וְיָסַח־לָּךְ

NOTE: As Morris (TEF, LXII, 228 f.) observes, in four instances the verb is used absolutely (Ex. 32:14; Lam. 3:42; II Kings 24:4; and Dan. 9:15 (Th)). In Dan. 9:19 (Th) *ἐλάσθητι* renders *תִּכְפָּרֶם*. In Dan. 9:19 (LXX) the translation is not so exact. However, Dan. 9:19 is not listed above since *ἐλάσκεσθαι* does not appear in the LXX at this point.

Morris observes further that *ἐλάσκεσθαι* occurs with the dative of person three times (II Kings 5:16 (2X); and Esther 4:17h). It occurs three times with the dative of sin: Ps. 78:38; Ps. 79:9, and Ps. 25:11. It occurs with the accusative of sin in Ps. 65:3. Morris apparently follows Cod. A and Cod. B and does not consider II Chr. 6:30 a valid occurrence of *ἐλάσκεσθαι*.

II Chr. 6:30, if a valid occurrence, is another instance of the verb with the dative of person.

## F. *ἐλασμός*

1. Leviticus	25:9	תִּכְפָּרֶם
2. Numbers	5:8	תִּכְפָּרֶם
3. I Chronicles	28:20 <sup>2</sup>	-
4. Psalm	130(LXX 129):4	תִּכְפָּרֶם

<sup>1</sup>There is no Hebrew text to correspond to this part of Esther, and this part of the Greek text is not a part of canonical Esther.

<sup>2</sup>No corresponding Hebrew word in MT.

5. Sirach	18:20 <sup>1</sup>	—
6. Sirach	35:3 <sup>2</sup>	—
7. Amos	8:14 <sup>3</sup>	בְּאַשִׁמָּה
8. Ezekiel	44:27	מִן־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
9. II Maccabees	3:33 <sup>4</sup>	—

NOTE: In Dan. (Th.) 9:9 οἱ ἑλασμοὶ appears as the Greek rendering of מַלְאָכָאֵל. The LXX does not use any form of ἑλασμος at this point.

### g. ἑλαστήριον

1. Exodus	25:17	כַּפֹּת
2. Exodus	25:18	חֲפָצֵי
3. Exodus	25:19	בֵּין־חֲפָצֵי
4. Exodus	25:20	עַל־חֲפָצֵי
5. Exodus	25:20	אֶל־חֲפָצֵי
6. Exodus	25:21	אֶת־חֲפָצֵי
7. Exodus	25:22	חֲפָצֵי
8. Exodus	31:7	וְאֶת־חֲפָצֵי
9. Exodus	35:12	אֶת־חֲפָצֵי
10. Exodus	37:6 (LXX 38:5)	כַּפֹּת
11. Exodus	37:8 (LXX 38:7) <sup>5</sup>	—
12. Exodus	37:8 (LXX 38:7)	בֵּין־חֲפָצֵי
13. Exodus	37:9 (LXX 38:8)	עַל־חֲפָצֵי
14. Leviticus	16:2	חֲפָצֵי
15. Leviticus	16:2	עַל־חֲפָצֵי

<sup>1</sup>No corresponding Hebrew word in MT.

<sup>2</sup>No corresponding Hebrew word in MT.

<sup>3</sup>The Greek is not an exact translation of the Hebrew at this point, whether the Hebrew be rendered "Ashimah" as in the RSV or "sin" as in the AV.

<sup>4</sup>No Hebrew text available.

<sup>5</sup>No corresponding Hebrew term in MT.

16.	Leviticus	16:13	אֶת-פְּנֵיָהּ
17.	Leviticus	16:14	פְּנֵיָהּ
18.	Leviticus	16:14	פְּנֵיָהּ
19.	Leviticus	16:15	עַל-פְּנֵיָהּ
20.	Leviticus	16:15	פְּנֵיָהּ
21.	Numbers	7:89	פְּנֵיָהּ
22.	Amos	9:1 <sup>1</sup>	—
23.	Ezekiel	43:14	עַד-פְּנֵיָהּ
24.	Ezekiel	43:14	וְהָיָה
25.	Ezekiel	43:14	עַד-פְּנֵיָהּ
26.	Ezekiel	43:17	וְהָיָה
27.	Ezekiel	43:20	פְּנֵיָהּ
28.	IV Maccabees	17:22 <sup>2</sup>	—

NOTE: In Gen. 6:15 (EV and MT) (LXX 6:16) Symmachus describes Noah's ark twice with τὸ ἱλαστήριον . . . τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου where the LXX has τὴν κιβωτὸν . . . τῆς κιβωτοῦ.

## H. ἱλαστήριος

1. IV Maccabees 17:22<sup>3</sup>

NOTE: Cod. A considers ἱλαστήριον an adjective, a form of ἱλαστήριος, but Cod. S and Bahlfs consider it a noun and a form of ἱλαστήριον. Compare the listing under ἱλαστήριον.

<sup>1</sup>There is no Hebrew word in the MT that corresponds to τὸ ἱλαστήριον. The Hebrew term that occupies the same place in the MT that τὸ ἱλαστήριον does in the LXX is רִתְּזָהּ which means "capital" (of pillar). Both T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 2, and Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," col. 3036, and *Bible Studies*, p. 127, f.n. 1, consider the LXX translators misread the Hebrew at this point.

<sup>2</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.

<sup>3</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.



## I. Ἰλῆως

1. Genesis	43:23	שְׁלֹמֹם
2. Exodus	32:12	וְהָיָה עָמָם
3. Numbers	14:19	בְּשִׁמְךָ אֱתָהּ
4. Numbers	14:20	וְלֹא תִּתֵּן
5. Deuteronomy	21:8	כִּי־רָ
6. I Samuel	14:45 <sup>1</sup>	עָלֶיךָ
7. II Samuel	20:20	עָלֶיךָ
8. II Samuel	20:20	עָלֶיךָ
9. II Samuel	23:17	עָלֶיךָ
10. I Kings	8:30	וְעָלֶיךָ
11. I Kings	8:34	וְעָלֶיךָ
12. I Kings	8:36	וְעָלֶיךָ
13. I Kings	8:39	וְעָלֶיךָ
14. I Kings	8:50	וְעָלֶיךָ
15. I Chronicles	11:19	עָלֶיךָ
16. II Chronicles	6:21	וְעָלֶיךָ
17. II Chronicles	6:25	וְעָלֶיךָ
18. II Chronicles	6:27	וְעָלֶיךָ
19. II Chronicles	6:39	וְעָלֶיךָ
20. II Chronicles	7:14	וְעָלֶיךָ
21. Amos	7:2	עָלֶיךָ
22. Isaiah	54:10	מִבְּרֵחַ מִצְרַיִם
23. Jeremiah	5:1	וְעָלֶיךָ

<sup>1</sup>Rudolf Kittel in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, in loc., notes Cod. B of the LXX presupposes a Hebrew text where  
 עָלֶיךָ has been omitted.

24.	Jeremiah	5:7	אָלֹחִים-לֵךְ
25.	Jeremiah	(27:20 LXX) 50:20 MT, EV	אָלֹחִים
26.	Jeremiah	(38:34 LXX) 31:34 MT, EV	אָלֹחִים
27.	Jeremiah	(43:3 LXX) 36:3 MT, EV	וְאָלֹחֵי
28.	I Maccabees	2:21 <sup>1</sup>	—
29.	II Maccabees	2:7 <sup>2</sup>	—
30.	II Maccabees	2:22 <sup>3</sup>	—
31.	II Maccabees	7:37 <sup>4</sup>	—
32.	II Maccabees	10:26 <sup>5</sup>	—
33.	IV Maccabees	6:28 <sup>6</sup>	—
34.	IV Maccabees	8:14 <sup>7</sup>	—
35.	IV Maccabees	9:24 <sup>8</sup>	—
36.	IV Maccabees	12:18(17) <sup>9</sup>	—

NOTE: Morris (TET, LXII, 229-230) mentions only 35 instances, and while he makes several pertinent observations, he does not list all 35 instances, so there is some question as to the occurrence listed here but omitted by Morris. Probably the instance listed here which he omits is I Sam. 14:45. It is among the instances which he does not mention in his remarks. Moreover, the LXX makes sense without it, and Rahlfs does not include *ἰλαως* in his eclectic text. In fact Rahlfs in his textual notes does not indicate that it appears in any manuscript, but only that it precedes *שֶׁחַד* in the recensions of Origen and Lucian.

However, Hatch and Redpath, *op. cit.*, in *loc.*, list it, noting only that Cod. B omits it. And Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Part I, in *loc.*, comment that *ἰλαως* precedes *שֶׁחַד* in Codices A b d l o p q t z e2 e2.

- 
- <sup>1</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>2</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>3</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>4</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>5</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>6</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>7</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>8</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.  
<sup>9</sup>No Hebrew text available for correlation.

## Appendix II

### CORRELATION OF HEBREW WORDS WITH VARIOUS GREEK TERMS IN THE LXX

#### A. תְּרוֹמָה

- |                    |                     |                           |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Exodus 21:30    | λύτρα               |                           |
| 2. Exodus 30:12    | λύτρα               | (Aq Sm Th have ἐξίλασμα)  |
| 3. Numbers 35:31   | λύτρα               |                           |
| 4. Numbers 35:32   | λύτρα               |                           |
| 5. I Samuel 12:3   | ἐξίλασμα            |                           |
| 6. Job 33:24       | No correlating word |                           |
| 7. Job 36:18       | No correlating word |                           |
| 8. Psalm (EV) 49:7 | ἐξίλασμα            |                           |
| 9. Proverbs 6:35   | λύτρον              |                           |
| 10. Proverbs 13:8  | λύτρον              | (Aq Sm Th have ἐξίλασμα.) |
| 11. Proverbs 21:18 | περικόθαρμα         | (Aq Sm Th have ἐξίλασμα.) |
| 12. Isaiah 43:3    | ἄλλαγμα             |                           |
| 13. Amos 5:12      | Cod. A ἀλλάγματα    | (Aq Sm Th have            |
|                    | Cod. B ἀντάλλαγματα | ἐξίλασμα.)                |
| 14. Sirach 46:19   | χρήματα             |                           |

NOTE: LXX renders תְּרוֹמָה with forms of λύτρον 6 times and with forms of ἐξίλασμα 2 times.

Aq Sy Th render תְּרוֹמָה with forms of λύτρον 4 times (including cognate words\*), and with forms of ἐξίλασμα 6 times).

\*Th replaces λύτρον with λυτρώσεως in Prov. 6:35.



## B. קִרְיָן

1. Exodus 29:36 <sup>1</sup>καθαρισμοῦ (Aq Sm Th use ἐξιλάσμα.)
2. Exodus 30:10 Cod. B καθαρισμοῦ  
Cod. A καθαρισμοῦ and ἐξιλάσμοῦ
3. Exodus 30:16 εἰσφορὰς
4. Leviticus 23:27 ἐξιλάσμοῦ
5. Leviticus 23:28 ἐξιλάσμοῦ
6. Leviticus 25:9 ἱλάσμοῦ
7. Numbers 5:8 Most Cod. ἱλάσμοῦ  
Cod. A ἐξιλάσμοῦ
8. Numbers 29:11 ἐξιλάσεως

## C. קִרְיָן

1. Exodus 25:17 ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα
2. Exodus 25:18 (τοῦ) ἱλαστηρίου
3. Exodus 25:19 (τοῦ) ἱλαστηρίου
4. Exodus 25:20 (τοῦ) ἱλαστηρίου
5. Exodus 25:20 (τὸ) ἱλαστήριον
6. Exodus 25:21 (τὸ) ἱλαστήριον
7. Exodus 25:22 (τοῦ) ἱλαστηρίου
8. Exodus 26:34 No corresponding Greek<sup>2</sup>
9. Exodus 30:6 No corresponding Greek
10. Exodus 31:7 (τὸ) ἱλαστήριον
11. Exodus 35:12 (τὸ) ἱλαστήριον

<sup>1</sup>Quell in Kittell's Biblia Hebraica, in loc., observes the LXX does not literally render the Hebrew.

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 1, A. Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 127, and Quell in Kittell's Biblia Hebraica, in loc., agree the LXX with καταπέτασματι presupposes קִרְיָן in the Hebrew.

12. Exodus 37:6 (LXX 38:5) (τὸ)<sup>1</sup> ἑλαστήριον  
 13. Exodus 37:7 No corresponding Greek  
 14. Exodus 37:8 (LXX 38:7) (τοῦ) ἑλαστηρίου  
 (Exact correspondence doubtful)  
 15. Exodus 37:9 (LXX 38:8) (τὸ) ἑλαστήριον  
 16. Exodus 37:9 (LXX 38:8) No corresponding Greek  
 17. Exodus 39:35 (LXX 39:15) No corresponding Greek  
 18. Exodus 40:20 No corresponding Greek  
 19. Leviticus 16:2 (τοῦ) ἑλαστηρίου  
 20. Leviticus 16:2 (τοῦ) ἑλαστηρίου  
 21. Leviticus 16:13 (τὸ) ἑλαστήριον  
 22. Leviticus 16:14 (τὸ) ἑλαστήριον  
 23. Leviticus 16:14 (τοῦ) ἑλαστηρίου  
 24. Leviticus 16:15 (τὸ) ἑλαστήριον  
 25. Leviticus 16:15 (τοῦ) ἑλαστηρίου  
 26. Numbers 7:89 (τοῦ) ἑλαστηρίου  
 27. I Chronicles 28:11 (τοῦ) ἐξιλασμοῦ

#### D. 𐤒𐤕𐤕 verb

##### I. 𐤒𐤕𐤕 Piel

1. Genesis 32:21 (20EV) ἐξιλάσομαι  
 2. Exodus 29:36 ἀγιάζειν  
 3. Exodus 29:37 καθαριεῖς  
 4. Exodus 30:10 ἐξιλάσεται  
 5. Exodus 30:10 καθαριεῖ  
 6. Exodus 30:15 ἐξιλάσασθαι

---

<sup>1</sup>Field, op. cit., I, 182, points out that in a few MSS ἑλαστήριον has been replaced with θυσιαστήριον.

7. Exodus 30:16 ἐξιλάσασθαι
8. Exodus 32:30 ἐξιλάσωμαι
9. Leviticus 1:4 ἐξιλάσασθαι
10. Leviticus 4:20 ἐξιλάσεται
11. Leviticus 4:26 ἐξιλάσεται
12. Leviticus 4:31 ἐξιλάσεται
13. Leviticus 4:35 ἐξιλάσεται
14. Leviticus 5:6 ἐξιλάσεται
15. Leviticus 5:10 ἐξιλάσεται
16. Leviticus 5:13 ἐξιλάσεται
17. Leviticus 5:16 ἐξιλάσεται
18. Leviticus 5:18 ἐξιλάσεται
19. Leviticus 5:26 ἐξιλάσεται
20. Leviticus 6:23 ἐξιλάσασθαι
21. Leviticus 7:7 ἐξιλάσεται
22. Leviticus 8:15 ἐξιλάσασθαι
23. Leviticus 8:34 ἐξιλάσασθαι
24. Leviticus 9:7 ἐξίλασαι  
Cod. A ἐξίλαση
25. Leviticus 9:7 ἐξίλασαι
26. Leviticus 10:17 ἐξιλάσησθε
27. Leviticus 12:7 ἐξιλάσεται
28. Leviticus 12:8 ἐξιλάσεται
29. Leviticus 14:18 ἐξιλάσεται
30. Leviticus 14:19 ἐξιλάσεται
31. Leviticus 14:20 ἐξιλάσεται
32. Leviticus 14:21 ἐξιλάσασθαι



33.	Leviticus 14:29	ἐξιλάσεται
34.	Leviticus 14:31	ἐξιλάσεται
35.	Leviticus 14:53	ἐξιλάσεται
36.	Leviticus 15:15	ἐξιλάσεται
37.	Leviticus 15:30	ἐξιλάσεται
38.	Leviticus 16:6	ἐξιλάσεται
39.	Leviticus 16:10	ἐξιλάσασθαι
40.	Leviticus 16:11	ἐξιλάσεται
41.	Leviticus 16:16	ἐξιλάσεται
42.	Leviticus 16:17	ἐξιλάσασθαι
43.	Leviticus 16:17	ἐξιλάσεται
44.	Leviticus 16:18	ἐξιλάσεται
45.	Leviticus 16:20	ἐξιλασκόμενος
46.	Leviticus 16:24	ἐξιλάσεται
47.	Leviticus 16:27	ἐξιλάσασθαι
48.	Leviticus 16:30	ἐξιλάσεται
49.	Leviticus 16:32	ἐξιλάσεται
50.	Leviticus 16:33	ἐξιλάσεται
51.	Leviticus 16:33	ἐξιλάσεται
52.	Leviticus 16:33	ἐξιλάσεται
53.	Leviticus 16:34	ἐξιλάσκεσθαι
54.	Leviticus 17:11	ἐξιλάσκεσθαι
55.	Leviticus 17:11	ἐξιλάσεται
56.	Leviticus 19:22	ἐξιλάσεται
57.	Leviticus 23:28	ἐξιλάσασθαι
58.	Numbers 5:8	ἐξιλάσεται
59.	Numbers 6:11	ἐξιλάσεται

60. Numbers 8:12 ἐξιλάσασθαι
61. Numbers 8:19 ἐξιλάσκεσθαι
62. Numbers 8:21 ἐξιλάσατο
63. Numbers 15:25 ἐξιλάσεται
64. Numbers 15:28 ἐξιλάσεται
65. Numbers 15:28 ἐξιλάσασθαι
66. Numbers 17:11 (EV 16:46) ἐξιλάσαι
67. Numbers 17:12 (EV 16:47) ἐξιλάσατο
68. Numbers 25:13 ἐξιλάσατο
69. Numbers 28:22 ἐξιλάσασθαι
70. Numbers 28:30 ἐξιλάσασθαι
71. Numbers 29:5 ἐξιλάσασθαι
72. Numbers 31:50 ἐξιλάσασθαι
73. Deuteronomy 21:8 ἕως γενοῦ
74. Deuteronomy 32:43 ἐκκαθαρίει
75. II Samuel 21:3 Cod. A ἐξιλάσομαι  
Cod. B ἐξιλάσωμαι
76. I Chronicles 6:34 (EV 49) ἐξιλάσκεσθαι
77. II Chronicles 29:24 ἐξιλάσαντο
78. II Chronicles 30:18 Cod. V  
Rahlfs' text ἐξιλασάσθω  
Cod. A, B ἐξιλάσθω
79. Nehemiah 10:34 (EV 33) ἐξιλάσασθαι
80. Psalms 65:4 (65:3 EV) ἱλάση
81. Psalms 78:38 ἱλάσεται
82. Psalms 79:9 ἱλάσθητι
83. Proverbs 16:14 ἐξιλάσεται

<sup>1</sup> 84.	Isaiah 47:11		καθαρὰ γενέσθαι
<sup>2</sup> 85.	Jeremiah 18:23		(μὴ) ἄθωψης
86.	Ezekiel 16:63		ἐξιλάσκεσθαι
<sup>3</sup> 87.	Ezekiel 43:20		ἐξιλάσονται
88.	Ezekiel 43:26		ἐξιλάσονται
89.	Ezekiel 45:15		ἐξιλάσκεσθαι
		Cod.	Ἀξιλάσασθαι
90.	Ezekiel 45:17		ἐξιλάσκεσθαι
91.	Ezekiel 45:20		ἐξιλάσεσθε
<sup>4</sup> 92.	Daniel 9:24	LXX	ἀπαλεῖψαι
		Th	ἐξιλάσασθαι

## II. 𐤒 𐤕 𐤕 Pual

1.	Exodus 29:33	ἡγιασθσαν
2.	Numbers 35:33	ἐξιλασθήσεται
3.	Proverbs 16:6 <sup>5</sup>	ἀποκαθαίρονται
4.	Isaiah 6:7	περικαθαριεῖ
5.	Isaiah 22:14	(οὐκ) ἀφεθήσεται

<sup>1</sup>The Greek here listed is a phrase as closely corresponding to the Hebrew as the verse contains. However, the translation in the LXX is quite free. The LXX contains "βόθυνος, καὶ ἐμπροσὶ εἰς αὐτόν," for which the MT has no corresponding phrase whatsoever.

<sup>2</sup>Aquila's version replaces ἄθωψης with ἐξιλάση.

<sup>3</sup>Rahlfs, in his edition of the LXX, op. cit., notes "κυκλῶ B pau.] + καὶ περιραντιεῖς αὐτοὺς uel sim. uel. (in O<sub>sub</sub> \*).".

If the text of Rahlfs, op. cit., is taken as the best reading of the LXX, the situation arises where one Greek word ἐξιλάσονται, is used to render two Hebrew words: 𐤒 𐤕 𐤕 and 𐤒 𐤕 𐤕 𐤕. Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., in loc., so list ἐξιλάσονται in this verse.

<sup>4</sup>Aquila also replaces ἀπαλεῖψαι with ἐξιλάσασθαι.

<sup>5</sup>Rahlfs, op. cit., in loc., observes LXX 15:27a = MT 16:6.



6. Isaiah 27:9<sup>1</sup>

ἀφαιρεθήσεται

7. Isaiah 28:18<sup>2</sup>

ἀφέλη

## III. 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 Hithpa'el

1. I Samuel 3:14

ἐξιλασθήσεται

## IV. 𐤒𐤓𐤕 Nithpa'el

1. Deuteronomy 21:8

ἐξιλασθήσεται

E. 𐤒𐤓𐤕 (only in Piel form)<sup>3</sup>

		Object
1. Exodus 32:11	ἐδεήθη	God
2. I Samuel 13:12	ἐδεηθήν	God
3. I Kings 13:6	δεήθητι	God
4.	ἐδεήθη	God
5. II Kings 13:4	ἐδεήθη	God
6. II Chronicles 33:12	ἐζήτησε	God
7. Job 11:19	δεηθήσονται	Men
8. Psalm 45:13 (LXX 44:12)	λιτανεύσουσιν	Men
9. Psalm 119:58 (LXX 118:48)	ἐδεήθην	God
10. Proverbs 19:6	θεραπεύουσιν	Men
11. Jeremiah 26:19 (LXX 33:19)	ἐδεήθησαν	God
12. Daniel 9:13	ἐξεζητήσαμεν	God
	ἐδεήθημεν	
	LXX	
	Th	

<sup>1</sup> Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in their versions replace ἀφαιρεθήσεται with ἐξιλασθήσεται.

<sup>2</sup> BDB, in loc., suggests the reading of the Targum 𐤒𐤓𐤕 is preferred to the MT. Wellhausen and Cheyne concur in this opinion. So also Kittel in his *Biblia Hebraica*, in loc. Both the AV and the RSV give a translation nearer to the meaning of the root 𐤒𐤓𐤕 than that of the root 𐤒𐤓𐤕.

<sup>3</sup> Only instances that appear in the Hebrew OT are considered. In Prov. 19:6, Ps. 45:13, and Job 11:19 the verb refers to favor with a human being; in all other instances the reference is to God.

			Object God
13.	Zechariah 7:2	ἐξιλάσασθαι	
14.	Zechariah 8:21	δεηθῆναι	God
15.	Zechariah 8:22	ἐξιλάσασθαι	God
16.	Malachi 1:9	ἐξιλάσκεσθαι	God

F. פתח פתח<sup>1</sup>

1. II Chronicles 4:9 (τὴν) αὐλήν
2. II Chronicles 4:9 (τῇ) αὐλῇ
3. II Chronicles 6:13 τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ ἱεροῦ<sup>2</sup>
4. Ezekiel 43:14 (τὸ) ἔλαστήριον
5. Ezekiel 43:14 (τοῦ) ἔλαστηρίου
6. Ezekiel 43:14 (τὸ) ἔλαστήριον
7. Ezekiel 43:17 (τὸ) ἔλαστήριον
8. Ezekiel 43:20 (τοῦ) ἔλαστηρίου
9. Ezekiel 45:19 (τοῦ) ἱεροῦ

G. פתח פתח<sup>3</sup>

I. Qal

1. Exodus 34:9 ἀφελεῖς
2. Numbers 14:19 ἄφες
3. Numbers 14:20 ἔλεως (αὐτοῖς εἰμι)
4. Numbers 30:6 καθαριεῖ
5. Numbers 30:9 καθαριεῖ
6. Numbers 30:13 καθαριεῖ
7. Deuteronomy 29:19<sup>4</sup> ἐνέλατεν<sup>5</sup> σὰι

<sup>1</sup>Only those instances that appear in the Hebrew OT are considered.

<sup>2</sup>So is the notation by J. Begrich in Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, in loc.

<sup>3</sup>Only instances that appear in the Hebrew OT are considered.

<sup>4</sup>Cod. A reads ἐνέλατεν<sup>5</sup> εἰν instead of ἐνέλατεν<sup>5</sup> σὰι according to the notes in Rahlfs' edition of the LXX.

8. I Kings 8:30 ἔλεως (ἔση)
9. I Kings 8:34 ἔλεως (ἔση)
10. I Kings 8:36 ἔλεως (ἔση)
11. I Kings 8:39 ἔλεως (ἔση)
12. I Kings 8:50 ἔλεως (ἔση)
13. II Kings 5:18 ἐλάσεται
14. II Kings 5:18<sup>1</sup> ἐλάσεται
15. II Kings 24:4 ἐλασθήναι
16. II Chronicles 6:21 ἔλεως (ἔση)
17. II Chronicles 6:27 ἔλεως (ἔση)
18. II Chronicles 6:27 ἔλεως (ἔση)
19. II Chronicles 6:30<sup>2</sup> ἐλάση
20. II Chronicles 6:39 ἔλεως (ἔση)
21. II Chronicles 7:14 ἔλεως (ἔσομαι)
22. Psalm 25:11 (LXX 24) ἐλάση
23. Psalm 103:3 (LXX 102)<sup>3</sup> (τὸν) ἐνέλατενόντα
24. Isaiah 55:7<sup>4</sup> ἀφήσει
25. Jeremiah 5:1 ἔλεως (ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς)
26. Jeremiah 5:7<sup>5</sup> ἔλεως (γένωμά σοι)

<sup>1</sup>Origen's recension gives ἐλασθήσεται according to Rahlfs' op. cit., in loc. Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., in loc., indicate Cod. A reads ἐλασθήσεται.

<sup>2</sup>This is the reading of Rahlfs' text, op. cit., and 1/4 to 1/2 of known minuscules. Cod. A and Cod. B read ἐλάση.

<sup>3</sup>Aquila's version replaces this with τὸν ἐλασκόμενον. Symmachus replaces the LXX with τὸν ἀφιέντα. Theodotion reads τὸν ἐλατενόντα.

<sup>4</sup>Field, op. cit., in loc., notes that Aquila's version reads "ὅτι πληθυνεὶ τὸν ἐλάσασθαι (fort. ἐλάσασθαι)."

<sup>5</sup>This is the reading of Rahlfs' edition of the LXX. Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., in loc., note Cod. S reads "ἔλεως (ἔσομαί σοι)."



27. Jeremiah 31:34 (LXX 38) ἔλως (ἔσομαι)  
 28. Jeremiah 33:8 (LXX 40) οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι  
 29. Jeremiah 36:3 (LXX 43) ἔλως (ἔσομαι)  
 30. Jeremiah 50:20 (LXX 27) ἔλως (ἔσομαι)  
 31. Lamentations 3:42 ἐλάσθης  
 32. Daniel 9:19<sup>1</sup>  
 33. Amos 7:2 ἔλως (γενεῶν)

## II. Niphal

1. Leviticus 4:20 ἀφεθήσεται  
 2. Leviticus 4:26 ἀφεθήσεται  
 3. Leviticus 4:31 ἀφεθήσεται  
 4. Leviticus 4:35 ἀφεθήσεται  
 5. Leviticus 5:10 ἀφεθήσεται  
 6. Leviticus 5:13 ἀφεθήσεται  
 7. Leviticus 5:16 ἀφεθήσεται  
 8. Leviticus 5:18 ἀφεθήσεται  
 9. Leviticus 5:26 ἀφεθήσεται  
 10. Leviticus 19:22 ἀφεθήσεται  
 11. Numbers 15:25 ἀφεθήσεται  
 12. Numbers 15:26 ἀφεθήσεται  
 13. Numbers 15:28 <sup>2</sup>ἀφεθήσεται

<sup>1</sup>There is no exact Greek word corresponding to the Hebrew in the LXX; ἐλάτευσον comes as close as any. The fact is that the LXX has rendered the Hebrew in a very free manner. In Theodotion's version ἐλάσθητι corresponds to תָּפַחְךָ.

<sup>2</sup>Rahlfs's text, op. cit., in loc., omits. He notes Cod. A contains ἀφεθήσεται and that Origen marks it with ✕.

## Appendix III

TRENDS IN THE USE OF *ἐλασκέσθαι* WORDS IN THE MAJOR VERSIONS  
AS COMPARED WITH THE SEPTUAGINT

Abbreviations: Aq = Aquila      Sm = Symmachus  
Th = Theodotion

A. Instances where one of these versions has replaced some other word with a member of the *ἐλασκέσθαι* group, or where a member of this group has been inserted in one of the versions:

1. *ἐξιλάσκειν*

- |                                  |                   |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| a. Aq Sm Th <i>ἐξιλάσῃ</i>       | LXX καθαριεῖς     |
| Ex. 29:37                        | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍         |
| b. Aq Sm Th <i>ἐξιλασθήσεται</i> | LXX ἀφαιρεθήσεται |
| Is. 27:3                         | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍         |
| c. Aq Th <i>ἐξιλάσασθαι</i>      | LXX ἀπαλεῖψαι     |
| Dan. 9:24                        | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍         |
| d. Aq <i>ἐξιλάσῃ</i>             | LXX ἀθωύσῃς       |
| Jer. 18:23                       | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍         |
| e. Sm <i>ἐξιλάσθῃ</i>            | LXX λέλνται       |
| Is. 40:2                         | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍         |

2. *ἐξίλασμα*

- |                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| a. Aq Sm Th <i>ἐξίλασμα</i> | LXX λέντρα                                |
| Ex. 30:12                   | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍                                 |
| b. Aq Sm Th <i>ἐξίλασμα</i> | LXX λέντρον                               |
| Prov. 13:8                  | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍                                 |
| c. Aq Sm Th <i>ἐξίλασμα</i> | LXX περικάθαρμα                           |
| Prov. 21:18                 | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍                                 |
| d. Aq Sm Th <i>ἐξίλασμα</i> | LXX Cod. A ἀλλάγματα<br>Cod. B ἀντάλλαγμα |
| Am. 5:12                    | MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁 𐤏𐤍                                 |

## 3. ἑξιλασμός

a. Aq Sm Th ἑξιλασμοῦ

Ex. 29:36

LXX καθαρισμοῦ

MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁

b. Aq ἑξιλασμοῦ

LXX καθαρισμοῦ  
Cod. B<sup>1</sup>

Ex. 30:10

MT 𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁

## 4. ἱλάσκεσθαι

a. Aq ἱλασκόμενον

Ps. 103(LXX 102):3

LXX ἐνὶ λατεύνοντα

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

b. Aq ἱάσασθαι  
(fort. ἱλάσασθαι)<sup>2</sup>

Is. 55:7

LXX ἀφήσει

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

c. Sm ἱλασκόμενος

Is. 1:14

LXX ἀνήσω.

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

d. Th ἱλάζων

Le. 6:26 (19)MT

LXX ἀναφέρων

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

e. Th ἱλάσθητι

Dan. 9:19

LXX ἱλάτευσον

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

## 5. ἱλασμός

Th οἱ ἱλασμοί  
Dan. 9:9

LXX No term

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

## 6. ἱλαστήριον

a. Sm (τὸ) ἱλαστήριον

Ge. 6:16 (15)MT

LXX (τὴν) κιβωτόν

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

b. Sm (τοῦ) ἱλαστηρίου

Gen. 6:16(LXX) (15)MT

LXX (τῆς) κιβωτοῦ

MT 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁

<sup>1</sup>LXX Cod. A and Rahlfs: καθαρισμοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τοῦ ἑξιλασμοῦ  
<sup>2</sup>F. Field, op. cit., II, 539.



## 7. ἑλαστής

a. Aq Th ἑλαστής

Ps. 85(86):5

LXX ἐπικεκῆς

MT פִּזְוִי

## 8. ἑλεως

a. Sm Th ἑλεώς (σοι)

I Sam. 20:2

LXX μηδαμῶς (σοι)

MT פִּזְוִי

b. Sm Th ἑλεώς

I Sam. 22:15

LXX μηδαμῶς

MT פִּזְוִי

B. Instances where one of the versions omits a member of the ἑλάσκεσθαι group or replaces it with another word, even though it appears in the LXX:

1. Aq Sm πλημμελήσει

Hab. 1:11

LXX<sup>1</sup> ἐξιλάσεται  
(No correspondence  
to the Hebrew)

MT פִּזְוִי

2. Aq Th συνοχή  
Sm ἀθυμία

Ex. 7:25

LXX ἐξιλασμός

MT פִּזְוִי

3. Aq οἰκοδόμημα  
Sm Th κιβώριον

Amos 9:1

LXX<sup>2</sup> ἑλαστήριον Cod. BW

LXX θυσιαστήριον Cod. Aq

MT פִּזְוִי

4. Aq Sm εἰρήνη

Gen. 43:23

LXX ἑλεως

MT פִּזְוִי

5. Aq (τοῦ) κρηπίδωματος

Sm (τῆς) περιδρομῆς

Th (τοῦ) ἄζαρά

Ez. 43:14

LXX (τὸ) ἑλαστήριον

MT פִּזְוִי

<sup>1</sup>There is no reason why ἐξιλάσεται should ever have been used.

<sup>2</sup>LXX Cod. BW probably rest on a misreading of the Hebrew.

6. Aq κρηπιδώματος

Ez. 43:14

LXX (τοῦ) ἐλαστηρίου

MT  $\overline{\text{ע}}\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{א}}\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ט}}\overline{\text{ה}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{י}}\overline{\text{ו}}$

7. Aq κρηπιδώματος

Ez. 43:14

LXX (τὸ) ἐλαστήριον

MT  $\overline{\text{ע}}\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{א}}\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ט}}\overline{\text{ה}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{י}}\overline{\text{ו}}$

8. Sm οἰκτεῖρων

Is. 54:10

LXX ἑλεως

MT  $\overline{\text{ע}}\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{א}}\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ט}}\overline{\text{ה}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{י}}\overline{\text{ו}}$

### C. Summation and Comparison

1. Number of version instances members of ἐλασκέσθαι group are introduced in versions:

a. Additions in Aq 13  
Additions in Sm 13  
Additions in Th 14

b. Number of instances 22

c.	Number of instances	Aq	Sm	Th	add a	ἐλασκ.	word	7
	Number of instances	Aq	Sm		add a	"	word	0
	Number of instances	Aq		Th	add a	"	word	2
	Number of instances		Sm	Th	add a	"	word	2
	Number of instances	Aq			adds a	"	word	4
	Number of instances		Sm		adds a	"	word	4
	Number of instances			Th	adds a	"	word	3

2. Number of version instances members of ἐλασκέσθαι group are omitted in versions:

a. Omissions in Aq 7  
Omissions in Sm 6  
Omissions in Th 3  
16

b. Number of instances 8

c.	Number of instances	Aq	Sm	Th	omit a	ἐλασκ.	word	3
	Number of instances	Aq	Sm		omit a	"	word	2
	Number of instances	Aq		Th	omit a	"	word	0
	Number of instances	Aq			omits a	"	word	2
	Number of instances		Sm		omits a	"	word	1
	Number of instances			Th	omits a	"	word	0

3. Special observations:

a. ἐξέλασμα replaces λῆτρον as the rendering of  $\overline{\text{ע}}\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{א}}\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ט}}\overline{\text{ה}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{י}}\overline{\text{ו}}$  in two instances in all three versions and is itself, never replaced by λῆτρον.

b.  $\beta$ υλασμός replaces καθαρισμός as the rendering of פִּרְיָהוּת in all three versions in one instance and in one version in another instance. It is never replaced by καθαρισμός.



## Appendix IV

### RELEVANT WORDS IN NON-CANONICAL LITERATURE

#### A. Greek Words

##### 1. ἑξιλάσκεσθαι

a. ἑξιλάσαι	Dan. 3:40.
b. ἑξιλάσκεσθαι	Letter of Aristeas, v. 314.
c. ἑξιλασάμενος	Letter of Aristeas, v. 316.
d. ἑξιλάσατο	Ps. Sol. 3:9(8).
e. ἑξιλάσκεται	Sirach 3:3.
f. ἑξιλάσεται	Sirach 3:30.
g. ἑξιλάσεται	Sirach 5:6.
h. ἑξιλάσατο	Sirach 16:7.
i. ἑξιλάσεται	Sirach 20:28.
j. ἑξιλάσεται	Sirach 28:5.
k. ἑξιλάσκεται	Sirach 34:19.
l. ἑξιλάσκεσθαι	Sirach 45:16.
m. ἑξιλάσατο	Sirach 45:23.
n. ἑξιλασκόμενοι	Test. XII Patr. T. Levi 3:5.

##### 2. ἑξιλασμός

a. ἑξιλασμόν	I Esdras 9:20.
b. ἑξιλασμόν	II Maccabees 12:45.
c. ἑξιλασμοῦ	Sirach 5:5.
d. δυνάστης ἑξιλασμῶν	Sirach 16:11.
e. ἑξιλασμός	Sirach 17:29.
f. ἑξιλασμόν	Sirach 18:12.

- g. ἐξιλασμόν Sirach 18:20.  
 h. ἐξιλασμός Sirach 35:3.  
 i. ἐξιλασμόν Wisdom of Solomon 18:21.
3. ἐλάσκεσθαι  
 a. ἐλάσθητι Esther 4:17h or Add. C, v. 10.  
 b. ἐλάσκοιο Sib. Or. III 625.  
 c. ἐλάσκον Sib. Or. III 628.  
 d. ἐλάσκεσθε Sib. Or. IV 167.
4. ἐλασμός  
 ἐλασμόν II Maccabees 3:33.
5. ἐλαστής  
 ἐλαστοῦ I Esdras 8:53.
6. ἔλεως  
 a. ἔλεως I Maccabees 2:21.  
 b. ἔλεως (γέννηται) II Maccabees 2:7.  
 c. ἔλεω II Maccabees 2:22.  
 d. ἔλεως II Maccabees 7:37.  
 e. ἔλεων [Some MSS ἔλεως]  
 (αὐτοῖς γενόμενον) II Maccabees 10:26.  
 f. ἔλεως (γενοῦ) IV Maccabees 6:28.  
 g. ἔλεως (ἐμὶν ἔσται) IV Maccabees 8:14.  
 h. ἔλεως IV Maccabees 9:24.  
 i. ἔλεως IV Maccabees 12:18.
7. ἐλαστήριος and ἐλαστήριον  
 a. Cod. A. ἐλαστήριον (adj.) IV Maccabees 18:22  
 b. Cod. S. ἐλαστήριον (noun)

## B. Latin words where no Greek or Hebrew texts are known

- |   |                              |  |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| 1. placando   | Assumption<br>of Moses 11:17 | (Moses) "propitiating"<br>(the Lord with an oath) -<br>Charles |
| Hilgenfeld's translation back into<br>Greek renders the Latin with ἱλασκόμενος. |                              |  |
| 2. propitiari   | Bk. Jubilees<br>16:22        | "that he might atone" -<br>Charles                             |
| 3. ut propitius sit   | Bk. Jubilees<br>22:14        | "that thou mayest be<br>forgiven" - Charles                    |
| 4. propitiatus (est)  | Bk. Jubilees<br>29:13        | "he was reconciled" -<br>Charles                               |
| 5. et omnis<br>propitiatio  | Bk. Jubilees<br>30:10        | "nor any atonement" -<br>Charles                               |

## C. Hebrew words rendered into Greek by forms of the ἱλάσκεσθαι group of words

- |                |                    |                              |
|----------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. תכפורים     |                    | Pirke Aboth 5:8 <sup>1</sup> |
| 2. תכפר        | ἑξιλάσεται         | Sirach 3:30                  |
| 3. יסלח        | ἑξιλάσεται         | Sirach 5:6                   |
| 4. נשא         | ἑξιλάσατο          | Sirach 16:7                  |
| 5. ולכפר       | ἑξιλάσκεσθαι       | Sirach 45:16                 |
| 6. ויכפר       | καὶ ἑξιλάσατο      | Sirach 45:23                 |
| 7. סליחא       | ἑξιλασμοῦ          | Sirach 5:5                   |
| 8. ונושא וסולא | δυνάστης ἑξιλασμῶν | Sirach 16:11                 |

<sup>1</sup>This instance is listed because תכפורים is a relevant word appearing in non-canonical literature, not because this instance has been rendered with a ἱλάσκεσθαι word in an authoritative translation.



# Appendix V

## כפר IN THE DEAD SEA MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE

### Special References:

1. William Hugh Brownlee (translator and ed.), "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12, 1951.
2. Millar Burrows (ed.), "Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline," in Vol. II, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

Instance	H e b r e w	Location		Brownlee's Translation
		Plate	Line	
1.	לכפר	2	8	"to pardon"
2.	בכפורים	3	4	"by atonement"
3.	יכופרו	3	6	"will be atoned"
4.	תכופר	3	8	"will be atoned"
5.	בכפורי	3	11	"through atonements"
6.	לכפר	5	6	"to atone"
7.	לכפר	8	6	"to atone"
8.	לכפר	8	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	"to make atonement"
9.	לכפר	9	4	"for making atonement"
10.	יכפר	11	14	"He will pardon or, atone for "

# Appendix VI

## כפר IN THE FRAGMENTS OF A ZADOKITE WORK OR THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

### Special References:

1. R. H. Charles (ed.), "The Fragments of a Zadokite Work," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books, Vol. II, 1913.
2. S. Schechter (ed.), Fragments of a Zadokite Work, edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection now in the possession of the University Library, Cambridge, and provided with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes, Vol. I of Documents of Jewish Sectaries (Cambridge: The University Press, 1910).
3. Chaim Rabin (ed.), The Zadokite Documents (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954).
4. Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The Viking Press, 1956).

Instance	Hebrew	Location and Translation in Reference	
1.	לכפר	2:3	"to pardon" Charles
		2:5	"to make conciliation" Rabin
2.	כפר	5:5	(God) "forgave" Charles
		3:18	(God) "made reconciliation" Rabin
3.	כפר	6:4	(whom God) "pardoned" Charles
		1:6	(for whom God) "made conciliation" Rabin
4.	לכפר	6:6	"to pardon" Charles
		line 9	"to make conciliation" Rabin
5.	יכפר	6:6	"(so) shall (God) pardon" Charles
		line 10	(so God) "shall make conciliation" Rabin
6.	וכפר	9:59	(God) "shall pardon" Charles
		XX:34	(God) "shall make conciliation" Rabin

<u>Instance</u>	<u>Hebrew</u>	<u>Location and Translation in Reference</u>	
7.	וַיְכַפֵּר	18:9 line 19	"and (God) will pardon" Charles "and he will make conciliation" Rabin

NOTE: Burrows renders the first six instances with a form of the word "forgive." He does not print a translation of the fragmentary text which contains the seventh.



## Appendix VII

## כפר IN QUMRAM CAVE I

## Special Reference:

D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, Jordan Department of Antiquities, Ecole Biblique et Archeologique Francaise, Palestine Archaeological Museum: Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert I, Qumram Cave I. With contributions by R. De Vaux, G. M. Crowfoot, H. J. Plenderleith, and G. L. Harding (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955).

Instance	Location		Editor's Translation
1.	22 111 7	[לכפר]	[in pardoning]
2.	88 111 11	יכפר	the expiation will be celebrated
3.	22 1v 3	[ויכ]ופר	[and it will be par] doned
4.	22 24 1	לכפר	No translation is given, because not enough text is available to make sense.
5.	25 4 4	וכופרם	and their ransom
6.	27 6 2	[י]כפר	he will pardon
7.	27 6 3	לכפר	in order to pardon
8.	Sa 1 3 or 28a(12Sa)	לכפר	in order to make expiation
9.	34 2 5	ליום כפורים	day of expiation.
10.	34 3 15	[כ]ופרנו	our ransom

NOTE: [ ] indicates conjecture of editors.

## ABBREVIATIONS

### A. Books of the Bible

Gen.	Genesis	Matt.	Matthew
Ex.	Exodus	Rom.	Epistle to the Romans or Romans
Lev.	Leviticus	I Cor.	I Corinthians
Num.	Numbers	II Cor.	II Corinthians
Deut.	Deuteronomy	Gal.	Galatians
Jos.	Joshua	Eph.	Ephesians
Judges	Jud.	Phil.	Philippians
I Sam.	I Samuel	Col.	Colossians
II Sam.	II Samuel	I Thes.	I Thessalonians
I Chr.	I Chronicles	II Thes.	II Thessalonians
II Chr.	II Chronicles	I Tim.	I Timothy
Neh.	Nehemiah	II Tim.	II Timothy
Est.	Esther	Heb.	To the Hebrews or Hebrews
Ps.	Psalms	I Pet.	I Peter
Prov.	Proverbs	Rev.	Revelations
Ecc.	Ecclesiastes		
Song of Sol.	The Song of Solomon		
Is.	Isaiah		
Jer.	Jeremiah		
Lam.	Lamentations		
Eze.	Ezekiel		
Dan.	Daniel		
Hab.	Habakkuk		
Zech.	Zechariah		
Mal.	Malachi		

### B. Books of the Apocrypha and Pseudipigrapha

Bk. Jubilees	Book of Jubilees
II Macc.	II Maccabees
IV Macc.	IV Maccabees
Ps. Sol.	Psalms of Solomon
Sib. Or.	Sibylline Oracles
Sir.	Sirach
Test. XII Patr.	The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs
T. Levi	Testament of Levi

### C. Bibliographical References

<u>BDB</u>	<u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic.</u>
<u>BTL</u>	<u>Hermann Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, 3d English edition translated from the German of the 2d edition by W. Urwick.</u>

- CAP R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. 2 vols.
- DBT James Hastings, ed., A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology.
- DoB James Hastings, Ed., Dictionary of the Bible.
- EB Encyclopaedia Biblica, A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, Vol. III.
- IB The Interpreter's Bible.
- ICC The International Critical Commentary.
- JTS The Journal of Theological Studies.
- KBL Ludwig Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.
- LCL The Loeb Classical Library.
- LSGL Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon.
- PCB A. S. Peake, ed., A Commentary on the Bible.
- SBD Melancthon W. Jacobus et al, editors, A New Standard Bible Dictionary.
- TET The Expository Times.
- TLNT Joseph Henry Thayer, ed., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.
- TWNT Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.
- ZWKU Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums.

#### D. Other References

- A, S, and T Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion
- Aq. Aquila
- AV Authorized Version



EV	English Version
HT	Hebrew Text
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RV	Revised Version
Sm.	Symmachus
Th.	Theodotion

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, James. The Religious Teachers of Greece. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908).

Addis, W. E. "The Psalms," (pp. 366-396) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Albright, W. F. "Not Likely to Change Beliefs," (pp. 19-20) in a series of Essays on "The Dead Sea Scrolls" (pp. 12-25) by Millar Burrows, Edward P. Arbez, Amos N. Wilder, Frank M. Cross, Jr., W. F. Albright, Gustave Weigel, William H. Brownlee, R. B. Y. Scott, James Muilenburg, and H. L. Ginsberg in The New Republic, April 9, 1956, Vol. 134, No. 15, Issue 2159.

Albright, W. F. "Postscript - The Chronology of the Dead Sea Scrolls" (pp. 57-60) in Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12. The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. Translation and Notes. by William Hugh Brownlee. (New Haven, Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

Alford, Henry. The Greek Testament: With a Critically Revised Text: A Digest of Various Readings: Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage: Prolegomena: And a Critical and Exegetical Commentary For the Use of Theological Students and Ministers. Four Volumes. Vol. II. (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1886).

Althaus, Paul. Der Brief an die Römer. Fünfte, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage, in Das Neue Testament Deutsch, herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Johannes Behm. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1946).

Andrews, H. T. "Daniel" (pp. 522-533) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Andrews, Herbert T. "The Letter of Aristea," (pp. 82-122) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles.

The Apocrypha, translated out of the Greek and Latin tongues, being the version set forth A.D. 1611 compared with the most Ancient Authorities and Revised A.D. 1894. (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1895).

Argyle, A. W. "The New Testament Interpretation of the Death of Our Lord," (pp. 253-256) in The Expository Times, Vol. LX.

Baillie, D. M. God Was in Christ, An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948).

Ball, C. J. "The Epistle of Jeremy," (pp. 596-611) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Barmby, J. (expositor). Romans, in The Pulpit Commentary, Edited by H. D. M. Spence and Joseph S. Exell. New Edition. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1901).

Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the sixth edition by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1950).

Barthelemy, D., and J. T. Milik. Jordan Department of Antiquities, Ecole Biblique et Archeologique Francaise, Palestine Archaeological Museum: Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I, Qumran Cave I. With contributions by R. DeVaux, G. M. Crowfoot, H. J. Plenderleith, and G. L. Harding. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955).

Bauer, Walter. Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literature. 4th ed. (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1952).

Beare, Francis W. "The Epistle to the Ephesians, Introduction and Exegesis," (pp. 397-749 in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, Vol. X. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953).

Beer, G. (ed.). "Libros Iob et Proverbiorum," in Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rud. Kittel. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Beet, Joseph Agar. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. 5th edition. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1885).

Behm, Johannes. "θύω, θυσία, θυσιαστήριον," (pp. 180-190) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Dritter Band: Θ - Κ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).

Behm, Johannes. "παράκλητος," (pp. 798-812) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel, In Verbindung mit zahlreichen Fachgenossen. herausgegeben von Gerhard Friedrich. Fünfter Band. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1954).

Bennett, W. H. The Books of Chronicles in The Expositor's Bible. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894).



Bennett, W. H. "I and II Samuel," (pp. 273-293) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Bennett, W. H. "The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children," (pp. 625-637) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Bensly, Robert L. (editor) and Montague Rhodes James (author of introduction). The Fourth Book of Ezra, The Latin Version Edited from the MSS. with an Introduction. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1895) in Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, edited by J. Armitage Robinson. Vol. 3, No. 2. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1895).

Berkouwer, G. C. Faith and Justification. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954).

Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, in The International Critical Commentary. 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1948-1949).

Bevan, Edwyn. Later Greek Religion. (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1927).

Bewer, J. A. (editor). "Librum Ezechiel," in Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rud. Kittel. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Würt. Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Beyer, Hermann Wolfgang. "θεραπεία, θεραπεύω, θεραπείων," (pp. 128-132) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Dritter Band: Θ - Κ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).

Birnbaum, Solomon A. The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography, in Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 13-14. (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1952).

Billerbeck, Paul. Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch. Zweite, unveränderte Auflage. Dritter Band, in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Hermann L. Strack und Paul Billerbeck. (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954).

Bissell, Edwin Cone. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with Historical Introductions, A Revised Translation, and Notes Critical and Explanatory, in A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students. By John Peter Lange, translated, revised, enlarged, and edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. XV. (Note: This work does not appear in the German edition.) (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880).

Blass, Friedrich. Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1898).

Box, G. H. The Ezra-Apocalypse, Being Chapters 3-14 of the Book Commonly Known as 4 Ezra (or II Esdras) Translated from a Critically Revised Text, with Critical Introductions, Notes and Explanations with a General Introduction to the Apocalypse, and an Appendix Containing the Latin Text. (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1912).

Box, G. H. "Fourth Ezra," (pp. 542-624) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. 2. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Box, G. H., and W. G. E. Oosterley, "The Book of Sirach," (pp. 268-517) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Breul, Karl. Cassell's New German and English Dictionary with a Phonetic Key to Pronunciation. Revised and enlarged by J. Heron Lepper and Rudolf Kottenhahn. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1939).

Brooke, Alan England, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray (editors). The Old Testament in Greek, According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Unicial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus, Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. 3 vols. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1906-1940)

Vol. I (Brooke & McLean). Parts I, 1906; II, 1909; III, 1911; IV, 1917.

Vol. II (Brooke, McLean, & Thackeray). Parts I, 1927; II, 1930; III, 1932; IV, 1935.

Vol. III (Brooke, McLean, & Thackeray). Part I, 1940.

Brooke, A. E. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles, in The International Critical Commentary. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952).



Brown, W. Adams. "Expiation and Atonement, Christian." (pp. 641-650) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Ed., James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Brownlee, William Hugh. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12. The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. Translation and Notes. (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

Broyde, Isaac. "Mandaeans," (pp. 286-288) in The Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. VIII. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1904).

Brunner, Emil. The Mediator, A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith. Translated by Olive Wyon. (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949).

Bruston, Par C. "Les consequences du vrai sens de ἐλαστήριον," (pp. 77-81) in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums. (Siebenter Jahrgang, 1906).

Büchsel, Friedrich. "ἀλλάσσω, ἀντάλλαγμα, ἀπ-, δι-, καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή, ἀποκατ-, μεταλλάσσω," (pp. 252-260) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Erster Band: A - Γ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1953).

Büchsel, Friedrich. "δίδωμι, δῶρον, δωρέομαι, δῶρημα, δωρεά, δωρεάν, ἀπο-, ἀνταποδίδωμι, ἀνταπόδοσις, ἀνταπόδομα, παραδίδωμι, παράδοσις," (pp. 168-175) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Zweiter Band: Δ - Η. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954).

Bultmann, Rudolf. "ἀφήμι, ἄφεσις, παρήμι, πάρεσις," (pp. 506-509) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Erster Band: A - Γ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1953).

Bultmann, Rudolf. "The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," (pp. 77-91) in New Testament Studies. Vol. I, No. 2, Nov., 1954.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., Vol. I, 1952; Vol. II, 1955).

Burney, C. F. "The Hebrew Word for 'Atone,'" (pp. 325-327) in The Expository Times. Vol. XXII. Oct., 1910-Sept., 1911. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).

Burrows, Miller. The Dead Sea Scrolls. (New York: The Viking Press, 1956).



Burrows, Millar, assisted by John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee (editors). The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. I. The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary. (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950).

Burrows, Millar, assisted by John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee (editors). The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. II, Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline. (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Henry Beveridge. 2 vols. (London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1949).

Campbell, Lewis. Religion in Greek Literature. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898).

Canney, Maurice A. "Amos," (pp. 547-554) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With a Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Carrier, Augustus Stiles, and Ovid R. Sellers. "Fasts and Feasts," (pp. 262-265) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. Revised. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Cassell's Latin-English English-Latin Dictionary. 26th ed. Revised by J. R. V. Marchant and Joseph F. Charles. (London: Cassell and Co., Ltd., 1952).

Charles, R. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St. John with Introductions, Notes, and English Translation, in The International Critical Commentary. 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950).

Charles, R. H. The Apocalypse of Baruch Translated from the Syriac Chapters I - LXXVII. From the Sixth Century MS. in the Ambrosian Library of Milan Chapters LXXVIII - LXXXVII. The Epistle of Baruch from a New and Critical Text Based on Ten MSS. and Published Herewith, Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896).

Charles, R. H. (editor). The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Charles, R. H. The Ascension of Isaiah Translated from the Ethiopic Version, Which, Together with the New Greek Fragment, the Latin Versions and the Latin Translation of the Slavonic, Is Here Published in Full, Edited with Introduction, Notes and Indices. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900).

Charles, R. H. "The Assumption of Moses," (pp. 407-424) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Charles, R. H. The Book of Enoch or I Enoch Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited with the Introduction, Notes and Indexes of the First Edition Wholly Recast, Enlarged and Rewritten Together with a Reprint from the Editor's Text of the Greek Fragments. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1912).

Charles, R. H. "The Book of Jubilees," (pp. 1-81) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913)

Charles, R. H. The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902).

Charles, R. H. The Assumption of Moses Translated from the Latin Sixth Century MS., the Unemended Text of Which Is Published Herewith, together with the Text in Its Restored and Critically Emended Form, Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1897).

Charles, R. H. The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew of Jubilees Otherwise Known Among the Greeks as Η ΑΕΠΤΗ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΣ Edited from Four Manuscripts and Critically Revised Through a Continuous Comparison of the Massoretic and Samaritan Texts, and the Greek, Syriac, Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions of the Pentateuch, and Further Emended and Restored in Accordance with the Hebrew, Syriac, Greek and Latin Fragments of this Book, which are Here Published in Full. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895).

Charles, R. H. "The Fragments of a Zadokite Work," (pp. 785-834) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Charles, R. H. "I Enoch or Book of Enoch," (pp. 163-281) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Charles, R. H. The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Edited from Nine MSS. Together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1908).

Charles, R. H. "The Martyrdom of Isaiah," (pp. 155-162) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Charles, R. H. Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testament. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914).

Charles, R. H. "Second Baruch or the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch," (pp. 470-526) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Charles, R. H. Studies in the Apocalypse. 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915).

Charles, R. H. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," (pp. 282-367) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Charles, R. H. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Translated from the Editor's Greek Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908).

Churton, W. R. The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures Being the Additions to the Old Testament Canon Which Were Included in the Ancient Greek and Latin Versions, the English Text of the Authorized Version Together with the Additional Matter Found in the Vulgate and Other Ancient Versions, Introductions to the Several Books and Fragments, Marginal Notes and References, and a General Introduction to the Apocrypha. (London: J. Whitaker, 1884).

Colson, F. H., and G. H. Whitaker. Philo with an English Translation. In Eleven Volumes. Vol. I. (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1949) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.



Colson, R. H., and G. H. Whitaker. Philo with an English Translation. In Eleven Volumes. Vol. II. (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1950) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.

Colson, R. H., and G. H. Whitaker. Philo with an English Translation. In Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes). Vol. III (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1954) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.

Colson, F. H., and G. H. Whitaker. Philo with an English Translation. In Eleven Volumes. Vol. V. (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1949), in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.

Colson, F. H. Philo with an English Translation. In Eleven Volumes. Vol. VI (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1950) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.

Colson, F. H. Philo with an English Translation. In Eleven Volumes. Vol. VII (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1950), in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.

Cook, S. A. "First Esdras," (pp. 1-58) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913)

Cook, S. A., F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth (editors). The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. VII: The Hellenistic Monarchies and the Rise of Rome. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1928).

Cooke, G. A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Ezekiel, in The International Critical Commentary. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936).

Cornford, F. M. Greek Religious Thought from Homer to the Age of Alexander. (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1923).

Cowley, A. E. "The Book of Judith," (pp. 242-267) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Cowley, A. E., and Ad. Neubauer (editors). Ecclesiasticus xxxix.15 to xlix.11. Translated from the Original Hebrew and Arranged in Parallel Columns with the English Revised Version of 1895. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897).

Cragg, Gerald R. "The Epistle to the Romans, Exposition," (pp. 373-668) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. IX. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954).

Cremer, Hermann. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. 3rd Eng. ed., translated from the German of the 2nd ed. by W. Urwick. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880).

Cremer, Herrmann. Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gräzität. Zehnte völlig durchgearbeitete und vielfach veränderte Auflage. hrsg. von Julius Kögel. (Gotha: Perthes A.-G., 1915).

Cremer, Herrmann. Supplement to Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Translated from the last German edition by William Urwick. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886).

Curtis, E. L. and A. A. Madsen. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Chronicles, in The International Critical Commentary. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910).

Davies, T. Witton. "Bel and the Dragon," (pp. 652-664) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Davies, T. Witton. "Deuteronomy," (pp. 231-243) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. 2nd ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1955).

Deissmann, G. Adolf. Bibelstudien, Beiträge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften, zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums. (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895).

Deissmann, G. Adolf. Bible Studies. Translated by Alexander Grieve. 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Deissmann, A. "Das vierte Makkabäerbuch," (pp. 149-177) in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments.

Zweiter Band. übersetzt und herausgegeben von E. Kautzsch. 2 vols. (Tübingen, Friburg i.B. und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900).

Deissmann, Adolf. "ΙΛΔCΤΗΡΙΟC und ΙΛΔCΤΗΡΙΟΝ. Eine lexikalische Studie," (pp. 193-212) in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums. Viertes Jahrgang. herausgegeben von Dr. Erwin Preuschen. (Giessen: J. Rickter'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Alfred Töpelmann), 1903).

Deissmann, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East, The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World. Translated by R. M. Strachan. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910).

Deissmann, G. Adolf. "Mercy Seat" (Col. 3027-3035), in Encyclopaedia Biblica, A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. III. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902).

Delling, Gerhard. "δομή," (pp. 492-495) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel, herausgegeben von Gerhard Friedrich. Fünfter Band: Ξ-Πα. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954).

Denney, James. The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917).

Denney, James. The Death of Christ, Its Place and Interpretation in the New Testament. 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902).

Denney, James. "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," (pp. 555-725) in The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. II. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1900).

Dittenberger, Wilhelmus. Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae Supplementum Sylloges Inscriptionum Graecarum. Vol. II. (Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzel, 1905).

Dittenberger, W. Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum. 3rd ed. 4 vols. (Leipzig: 1915-1924).

Dix, Dom Gregory. Jew and Greek, A Study in the Primitive Church. (London: Dacre Press, 1953).

Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures, The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology. (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1953).



Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954).

Dodd, C. H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. In The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1949).

Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953).

Dodd, C. H. "ΙΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ, Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint," (pp. 352-360) in The Journal of Theological Studies, July, 1931, Vol. XXXII.

Dodd, C. H. The Johannine Epistles. In The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1946).

Dodd, C. H. New Testament Studies. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952).

Driver, S. R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. 3d edition. In The International Critical Commentary. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902).

Driver, S. R. "Expiation and Atonement, Hebrew," (pp. 653-659) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Driver, S. R. "Propitiation," (pp. 128-132) in A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. IV. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902).

Duff, Archibald. "Esther," (pp. 336-340) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Duthie, C. S. "The Mind of Christ - III. Is the Gospel Simple?" (pp. 238-240) in The Expository Times. Vol. LXII, No. 8, May, 1951.

Eberhard, Alfredi. Fabulae Romanenses Graece Conscriptae ex Recensione et cum Adnotationibus. Volumen Prius quo continentur de Syntips et de Aesopo Narrationes Fabulosae Partim Ineditae. (Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1872).

Eberharter, Andreas. Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus. Band VI, Abteilung 5, in Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1925).

Edersheim, A. "Ecclesiasticus," (pp. 1-239) in The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611) with an Explanation and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation. Vol. II. Edited by Henry Wace. 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1888).

Richrodt, Walther. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Teil I, 2nd Auflage. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939).

Emmet, Cyril W. "The Third Book of Maccabees," (pp. 155-173) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Elmslie, W. A. L. "The First and Second Books of Chronicles, Introduction, Exegesis, and Exposition," (pp. 341-548) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. III. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954).

Erdman, Charles R. An Exposition. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1925).

Erdman, Charles R. An Exposition. The General Epistles. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1919).

Ewald, Heinrich. The History of Israel. Translated from the German by J. Estlin Carpenter. Vol. V. The History of Ezra and of the Hagiocracy in Israel to the Time of Christ. 2d ed. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1880).

Fairbanks, Arthur. "Expiation and Atonement, Greek," (pp. 651-653) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Fairbanks, Arthur. "Propitiation, Greek," (pp. 397-398) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. X. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918).

Fairbridge, Maurice Harry. Studies in Biblical and Semitic Symbolism. (London: Kegan Paul, 1923).

Fairweather, W. "II Maccabees," (pp. 187-196) in A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology. Vol. III. Edited by James Hastings. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900).

Fairweather, W., and J. Sutherland Black. The First Book of Maccabees with Introduction and Notes. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1897).

Farnell, Lewis Richard. The Cults of the Greek States. 5 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1896-1909).

Feine, Paul. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 10., unveränderte Auflage, Neubearbeitet von D. Johannes Behm. (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1954).

Feine, Paul. Der Römerbrief. Eine exegetische Studie. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903).

Feine, Paul. Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Unveränderter Nachdruck der achten, durchgesehenen Auflage 21. und 22. Tausend der Gesamtauflage. (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1953).

Fiebig, Paul. "Kappôres," (pp. 341-343) in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums. (Vierter Jahrgang, 1903).

Field, Fridericus. Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta; post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam Versione Syro-Hexapla, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit. 2 vols. (Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875).

Filson, Floyd V. Opening the New Testament. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952).

Filson, Floyd Vivian. St. Paul's Conception of Recompense. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1931).

Findlay, G. G. "Romans" (pp. 817-831) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake, with supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Feerster, Werner. "ἀρέσκω, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, ἀρεσκέα, ἀρεστός, εὐάρεστος, εὐαρεστέω," (pp. 455-457) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Erster Band: A-Γ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1953).

Forbes, John. Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Tracing the Train of Thought by the Aid of Parallelism, with Notes and Dissertations on the Principal Difficulties Connected with the Exposition of the Epistle. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1868).

Forbes, Nevill (translator from the Slavonic) and R. H. Charles (commentator). "Second Enoch or The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," (pp. 425-469) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions



and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Fraenkel, Siegmund, "Zu dem semitischen Original von ἐλαστήριος und ἐλαστήριον," (pp. 257-258) in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums. herausgegeben von Erwin Preuschen, Fünfter Jahrgang. (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Alfred Töpelmann, 1904).

Franks, R. S. "Job," (pp. 346-365) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Frazer, J. G. The Golden Bough. 3d ed. 12 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1911-1915). Note: Vols. 1-3, 1911; Vol. 4, 1912; Vols. 5, 6, 1914; Vols. 7, 8, 1912; Vols. 9-11, 1913; Vol. 12, 1915.

Frazer, J. G. The Golden Bough. Abridged edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1923).

Garvie, Alfred E. (ed.) Romans, Introduction, Authorized Version, Revised Version with Notes, Illustrations, in The Century Bible. (London: Blackwood, Le Bas & Co., no date).

Gaster, M. (translator and editor). The Chronicles of Jerahmeel; or The Hebrew Bible Historiale, Being a Collection of Apocryphal and Pseudo-Epigraphal Books Dealing with the History of the World from the Creation to the Death of Judas Maccabeus, Together with an Introduction, Critical Notes, a Full Index, and Five Facsimiles. (London: The Royal Asiatic Society, 1899).

Gaugler, Ernst. Der Römerbrief. (1 Teil: Kapitel 1-8) in Prophezei-Schweizerisches Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1943).

Geffcken, Joh. Die Oracula Sibyllina, Bearbeitet im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, in Die Griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902).

Gifford, E. H. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans with Notes and Introduction. (London: John Murray, 1886).

Girdlestone, Robert Baker. Synonyms of the Old Testament: Their Bearing on Christian Faith and Practice. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871).

Godet, F. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated by A. Cusin. Vol. I. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880).

Goodspeed, Edgar J. The New Testament, An American Translation. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939).

Gordon, A. R. "Habakkuk," (pp. 566-568) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With a Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Grant, F. C. "Johannine Problem," p. 398 in An Encyclopedia of Religion. Edited by Vergilius Ferm. (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945).

Gray, G. Buchanan. "Passover and Unleavened Bread: The Laws of J, E, and D," (pp. 241-253) in The Journal of Theological Studies, July, 1936, Vol. 37.

Gray, G. Buchanan. "The Psalms of Solomon," (pp. 625-652) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Gray, George Buchanan. Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Its Theory and Practice. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925).

Gray, L. H. "Expiation and Atonement, Introductory and Primitive," (pp. 635-636) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Greeven, Heinrich. "δέομαι, δέησις, προσδέομαι," (pp. 39-42) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Zweiter Band: Δ-Η. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935).

Gregg, J. A. F. "Additions to Esther," (pp. 665-684) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur Surridge Hunt. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. (London, 1898-1927)

Grenfell, Bernard P., Arthur Surridge Hunt, and David George Hogarth. Fayum Towns and Their Papyri. With a chapter by J. G. Milne. (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900).

Gressmann, Hugo. Mose und seine Zeit. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913).

Grieve, A. J. "Malachi," (pp. 585-587 in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Griffith, Gwilym O. St. Paul's Gospel to the Romans. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949).

Grimm, Carl Ludwig Willibald. Das erste Buch der Maccabäer, in Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments. Dritte Lieferung. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853).

Grimm, Carl Ludwig Willibald. Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer, in Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments. Vierte Lieferung. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1857).

Guthrie, W. K. C. Orpheus and Greek Religion, A Study of the Orphic Movement. (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1935).

Gwatkin, H. M. "Jewish History from the Maccabees to the Destruction of Jerusalem," (pp. 607-611) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Hadas, Moses (editor and translator). The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953).

Hadas, Moses (editor and translator). Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas). (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951).

Haldane, Robert. Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans: with Remarks on the Commentaries of Dr. Macknight, Professor Moses Stuart, and Professor Tholuck. 9th ed. (Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Co., 1874).

Hall, H. R. "Expiation and Atonement, Egyptian," (pp. 650-651) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Harford, George. "Exodus," (pp. 168-195) in A Commentary on the Bible. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Harris, J. Rendel (translator of the Syriac, Aramaic, and Greek Versions), Agnes Smith Lewis (translator of the Arabic Version), and F. C. Conybeares (translator of the



Armenian Version). "The Story of Ahikar," (pp. 715-784) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Harrison, Jane E. Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion. 3rd ed. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1922).

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books). 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897).

Haupt, Erich. The First Epistle of St. John, A Contribution to Biblical Theology. Translated with an introduction by W. B. Pope. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879).

Haydon, A. "Blood," (p. 80) in An Encyclopedia of Religion. Ed., Vergilius Ferm. (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945).

Hebert, A. G. "Atone," (pp. 25-26) in A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952).

Hebert, A. G. The Throne of David, A Study of the Fulfilment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ and His Church. (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1941).

Hempel, J. "Librum Deuteronomii," in Biblia Hebraica. Edited by R. Kittel. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Henslow, G. The Vulgate - The Source of False Doctrines. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1909).

Herford, R. Travers. "Pirke Aboth: The Sayings of the Fathers," (pp. 686-714) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Herrmann, Johannes, and Friedrich Büchsel. "ἑλεως, ἑλάσκειν, ἑλάσμός, ἑλαστήριον," (pp. 300-324) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Dritter Band: Θ - Κ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).

Hilgenfeld, Adolphus (ed.). Messias Judaeorum, Libris Eorum Paulo Ante Et Paulo Post Christum Natum Conscriptis Illustratus. (Lipsiae: Sumptu Fuesiano (R. Reisland), 1869).

Holmes, Samuel. "Joshua," (pp. 248-255) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Holmes, Samuel. "The Wisdom of Solomon," (pp. 518-568) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version Containing the Old and New Testaments. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1954).

Hooke, S. H. The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1935. (London: Oxford University Press, 1938).

Hooke, S. H. "The Proverbs," (pp. 397-410), in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Howard, Wilbert F. "The Gospel According to St. John, Introduction and Exegesis," (pp. 437-811) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. VIII. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952).

Huber, Raphael M. "Clement, St., Pope of Rome (ca. 92-101) and Clementine Epistles" (pp. 177-178) in An Encyclopedia of Religion. Edited by Vergilius Ferm. (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945).

Hughes, H. Maldwyn. The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature. (London: Robert Culley, n.d.).

Hughes, H. M. "Third Baruch, or the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch," (pp. 527-541) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Hunter, A. M. Paul and His Predecessors. (London: Nicholson & Watson, Ltd., 1940).

James, E. O. Origins of Sacrifice, A Study in Comparative Religion. (London: John Murray, 1933).

James, M. R. (ed.). Apocrypha Anecdota, Second Series. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1897), in Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson. Vol. V, No. 1. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1897).

Jelf, William Edward. A Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877).

Jeremias, Joachim. "ἀπὸς, ἀρχή, ἀρτίον," (pp. 342-345) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Erster Band: A - Γ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1953).

Jones, Horace Leonard. The Geography of Strabo with an English Translation. In Eight Volumes. Vol. II. (London: William Heinemann, 1923), in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by E. Capps, T. E. Page, and W. H. D. Rouse.

de Jonge, M. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin. (Assen, Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum and Comp. N.V., 1953).

Jowett, B. The Dialogues of Plato, Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions. In Four Volumes. Vol. IV. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911).

Kautzsch, E. (translator and editor), Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. 2 vols. (Tübingen, Freiburg i.B. und Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900).

Kautzsch, E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Second English edition revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition (1909) by A. E. Cowley. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1949).

Kay, D. M. "Susanna," (pp. 638-651) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Kennedy, A. R. S. "Altar," (pp. 23-24) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).



Kennedy, A. R. S. "Atonement, Day of," (pp. 74-75) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Kennedy, A. R. S. "Sacrifices and Offerings," (pp. 810-818) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Kennedy, A. R. S. "Shewbread," (pp. 495-497) in A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology. Vol. IV. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902).

Kennedy, H. A. A. St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913).

Kennedy, H. A. A. The Theology of the Epistles. (London: Duckworth, 1948).

Kennett, R. H. "Zechariah," (pp. 575-583) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Kenyon, F. G. "Greek Versions of the Old Testament," (pp. 315-320) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Kerr, C. M. "Propiation, Introductory and Biblical," (pp. 393-397) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. X. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918).

Kittel, G. "Zur Erklärung von Röm. 3:21-26," (pp. 217-233) in Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Jahrgang, 1907).

Kittel, Rudolf, editor. "Librum Jessiae," in Biblia Hebraica. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Klatt, Edmund. Langenscheidt's Pocket-Dictionary of the English and German Languages. Second Part. German-English. Revised by Wilhelm Mosle. New edition, 1951. (Berlin-Schöneberg: Langenscheidt KG, 1951).

Klein, G. "Kappores," (pp. 343-344) in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums. Viertes Jahrgang, 1903.

Kleist, James A. (translator and annotator). The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch.

(Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1946). In Ancient Christian Writers, The Works of the Fathers in Translation. Edited by Johannes Quasten and Joseph C. Plumpe. No. 1 (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1946).

Knox, John. Chapters in a Life of Paul. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954).

Knox, John. "The Epistle to the Romans, Introduction and Exegesis," (pp. 355-668) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. IX. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954).

Knox, Wilfred L. St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1925).

Knox, Wilfred L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1939).

Knox, Wilfred L. Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1942. (London: Oxford University Press, 1944).

Köhler, Ludwig. Theologie des Alten Testaments, in Neue Theologische Grundrisse. Herausgegeben von Rudolf Bultmann. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936).

Koehler, Ludwig, and W. Baumgartner. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953).

König, Ed. "The Hebrew Word for 'Atone,'" (pp. 232-234) in The Expository Times. Vol. XXII, Oct., 1910-Sept., 1911. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).

Kohler, Kaufmann. "Saul of Tarsus," (pp. 79-87), in The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer. Vol. XI. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1905).

Kraetzschmar, Richard. Das Buch Ezechiel, in Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. herausgegeben von Dr. W. Nowack. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900).

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Shepherd of Hermas," in The Apostolic Fathers with an English Translation. In Two Volumes. Vol. II. (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1913) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page and W. H. D. Rouse.

Lanchester, H. C. O. "The Sibylline Oracles," (pp. 368-406) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Lane, E. C. "Old Testament Chronology," (pp. 640-641) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenas. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Langdon, S. H. "Expiation and Atonement - Babylonian," (pp. 637-640) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Langdon, W. H. "The Hebrew Word for 'Atone,'" (pp. 320-325) in The Expository Times. Vol. XXII, Oct., 1910-Sept., 1911. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).

Langhorne, John and William (translators and commentators). Plutarch's Lives of Illustrious Men Translated from the Greek with Notes Critical and Historical, and a Life of Plutarch. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. (London: Chatto & Windus, 1903).

Law, Robert. The Tests of Life, A Study of the First Epistle of St. John. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Levi, Israel. The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. No. III in Semitic Study Series by Richard J. H. Gott-  
heil and Morris Hastrow, Jr. (Leiden: Late E. J. Brill, 1904).

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition revised and augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951).

Liddon, H. P. Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893).

Lietzmann, Hans. Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer. Dritte Auflage. Band 8 in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928).

Lightfoot, J. B. Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1904).

Lipsius, R. A. Briefe an die Galater, Römer, Philipper. Zweiter Band. Zweite verbesserte Auflage, in Hand-kommentar zum neuen Testament. (Freiburg I.B.: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1892).

Loewe, H. "Expiation and Atonement, Jewish," (pp. 659-664) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Lofthouse, W. F. "Leviticus," (pp. 196-212) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).



Macgregor, G. H. C. The Gospel of John, in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1928).

Mackenzie, William D. "Propitiation," (pp. 743-744) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1950).

Mackenzie, William D. "Reconciliation and Atonement," (pp. 762-764) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. revised. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1950).

McCurdy, J. R., and J. M. Powis Smith. "Semitic Religion," (pp. 817-828) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3rd ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Manson, T. W. "ἸΛΔΘΗΡΙΟΝ," (pp. 1-10) in The Journal of Theological Studies. Vol. XLVI. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1945).

Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke, in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1930).

Marcus, Ralph. Josephus with an English Translation. In Nine Volumes. Vol. VII. Jewish Antiquities, Books XII-XIV. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1942), in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.

Margolis, Max L. "Day of Atonement," (pp. 284-289) in The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer. Vol. II. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1902).

Marsh, John. "The Book of Numbers, Introduction and Exegesis," (pp. 135-308) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. II. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953).

Maurice, Frederick D. The Epistles of St. John. A Series of Lectures on Christian Ethics. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1867).

Meecham, H. G. "Romans iii. 25f., iv. 25 - The Meaning of ὁ δὲ α. acc.," (p. 564) in The Expository Times. Vol. I (Oct., 1938-Sept., 1939). (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).

Mendelssohn, Lvdoici and Pavlys Wendland. Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistvla Cvm Ceteris de Origine Versionis LXX Interpretvm Testimoniiis. (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1900).

Metzger, Bruce M. "Mystery Religions, Relation of, to Early Christianity," (pp. 771-773 in Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, An Extension of The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. ("Koeberle to Zwischen"). (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1955)

Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. The translation revised and edited, with the sanction of the author, by William P. Dickson. Part IV. The Epistle to the Romans. Vol. I. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879).

Meyer, Rudolf, and Friedrich Hauck. "καθαρός, καθαρίζω, καθαίρω, καθαρότης, ἀκάθαρτος, ἀκαθαρσία, καθαρισμός, ἑκκαθαίρω, περὶ κάθαρμα," (pp. 416-434) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Dritter Band Θ - Κ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).

M'Fadyen, J. E. "Ezekiel," (pp. 501-521) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Micklem, Nathaniel. "The Book of Leviticus, Introduction and Exegesis," in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. II. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953).

Mitchell, Hinckley C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai and Zechariah, in The International Critical Commentary. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Moffatt, James. "The Second Book of Maccabees," (pp. 125-154) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Moore, George F. "Sacrifice," (cols. 4183-4233) in Encyclopaedia Biblica, A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. IV. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902).

Morfill, W. R. (translator from the Slavonic) and R. H. Charles (commentator). The Book of the Secrets of Enoch. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1896).

Morison, James. The Nature of the Atonement or The Question, What Is the Atonement? Answered. New Edition Revised. (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., 1890).

Morison, James. A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. (London: Hamilton Adams and Co.; Glasgow: T. D. Morison, 1866).

Morison, Walter. Passio Christi: Three Discourses Bearing on the Sufferings of Our Lord and the Nature of the Atonement; With Notes on Certain Views of Mr. Maurice, Dr. Bushnell, Dr. F. M'Leod Campbell, Dr. William Anderson, and Others. (Glasgow: Robert Gowanlock, 1871).

Morris, Leon. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955).

Morris, Leon. "The Biblical Idea of Atonement," (pp. 83-95) in Australian Biblical Review. Vol. II, Nos. 3-4, Sept.-Dec., 1952. (Melbourne: Fellowship for Biblical Studies, Dept. of Semitic Studies, University of Melbourne).

Morris, Leon. "The Meaning of *ἐλασθήριον* in Romans 11:25," (pp. 33-43) in New Testament Studies. Vol. II, No. 1, Sept., 1955.

Morris, Leon. "The Use of *ἐλάσκειν* etc. in Biblical Greek," (pp. 227-233) in The Expository Times. Vol. LXII, No. 8, May, 1951.

Morris, Leon. "The Wrath of God," (pp. 142-145) in The Expository Times. Vol. LXIII, No. 5, Feb., 1952.

Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953).

Moule, Handley C. G. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894).

Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek Based on W. F. Moulton's Edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar. Vol. I. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906).

Moulton, James Hope, and Wilbert Francis Howard. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. II. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929).

Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1952).

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament According to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899).

Mowinkel, Sigmund. Religion und Kultus. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953).



Mozley, J. K. "Constructive Theology VIII. Reconciliation," (pp. 359-363) in The Expository Times. Vol. LI, No. 8, May, 1940.

Murray, Gilbert. Five Stages of Greek Religion. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925).

Murray, James A. H. (editor). A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles: Founded Mainly on the Materials Collected by The Philological Society. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, Vol. I, 1888; Vol. III, 1897).

Neilson, William Allan (editor in chief), Thomas A. Knott (general editor), and Paul W. Carhart (managing editor). Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language. Second Edition. Unabridged. (Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Co., Publishers, 1935).

Nestle, D. Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine Utrumque textum cum apparatu critico imprimendum curavit. (Editio sexta decima. Der griechische Teil entspricht, mit einigen kleinen Verbesserungen, der 21. griech. Auflage 1932). (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1954).

Nestle, Eb. "Septuagint," (pp. 435-454) in A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology. Vol. IV. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902).

Newell, William R. Romans, Verse by Verse. (Chicago: Grace Publications, 1943).

Niese, Benedictus (ed.). Flavii Iosephi Opera. Vol. IV: Antiquitatum Iudaicarum Libri XVI-XX et Viat. (Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1890).

North, C. R. "Sacrifice," (pp. 206-214) in A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952).

North, Christopher R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. (London: Oxford University Press, Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950).

Noth, Martin. Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948).

Nourse, E. E. "Hexateuch," (pp. 345-352) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenas. 3d ed. revised. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Nygren, Anders. Commentary on Romans. Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1955).

Oepke, Albrecht. "ῥιάν," (pp. 64-69) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Zweiter Band: Δ - Η. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935).

Oepke, Albrecht. "ῥάομαι, ῥάοις, ῥάμα, ῥαρός," (pp. 194-215) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Dritter Band: Θ - Κ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).

Oesterley, W. O. E. "Ezra-Nehemiah," (pp. 323-335) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The First Book of Maccabees," (pp. 59-124) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Oesterley, W. O. E. A History of Israel. Vol. II: From the Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C. to the Bar-Kokhba Revolt, A.D. 135, in A History of Israel by W. O. E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932).

Oesterley, W. O. E. The Psalms Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1953).

Oesterley, W. O. E. Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, Their Origin, Purposes, and Development. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937).

Oesterley, W. O. E. "Vows," (p. 960) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Oesterley, W. O. E. The Wisdom of Jesus the Son Sirach of Ecclesiasticus in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes, in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1912).

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Theodore H. Robinson. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1934).

Orr, James. "Atonement," (pp. 71-74) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Orr, James. "Propitiation," (p. 765) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Paterson, W. P. "Sacrifice," (pp. 329-349) in A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology. Vol. IV. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902).

Paton, L. B. "Esther," (pp. 229-232) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. revised. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Paton, W. R., and E. L. Hicks. The Inscriptions of Cos. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1891).

Paul, Hermann. Deutsches Wörterbuch. Vierte Auflage. Bearbeitet von Karl Euling. (Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1935).

Peake, Arthur S. "Genesis," (pp. 133-167) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With a Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Peake, Arthur S. "Isaiah I-XXXIX," (pp. 436-459) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Pearson, A. C. "Propitiation, Roman." (pp. 398-400) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. X. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918).

Pedersen, Johs. Israel, Its Life and Culture. III-IV. Translated by Annie I. Fausbøll. (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1940).

Perrin, Bernadotte. Plutarch's Lives with an English Translation. In Ten Volumes. Vol. 1. (London: William Heinemann, 1914) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page and W. H. D. Rouse.

Perrin, Bernadotte. Plutarch's Lives with an English Translation. In Ten Volumes. Vol. 2. (London: William Heinemann, 1914) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page and W. H. D. Rouse.



Perrin, Bernadotte. Plutarch's Lives with an English Translation. In Ten Volumes. Vol. 3. (London: William Heinemann, 1916) in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by E. Capps, T. E. Page, and W. H. D. Rouse.

Peters, Norbert. Die Sahidisch-Koptische Uebersetzung des Buches Ecclesiasticus auf ihren wahren Werth für die Textkritik. (Frieberg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1898).

Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. Rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1948).

Philippi, Friedrich Adolph. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition by the Rev. J. S. Banks. 2 vols. Vol. I. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1878).

Phillips, J. B. Letters to Young Churches, A Translation of the New Testament Epistles. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935).

Phythian-Adams, W. J. The People and the Presence, A Study of the At-one-ment. (London: Oxford University Press, 1942).

Phythian-Adams, W. J. The Way of At-one-ment. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1944).

Platt, Frederic. "Propitiation," (pp. 281-284) in Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. Vol. II. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918).

Price, Ira Maurice. "Apocrypha," (pp. 41-43) in Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

Procksch, O. (ed.). "Librum XII Prophetarum," in Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rud. Kittel. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Procksch, Otto. Theologie des alten Testaments. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1950).

Procksch, O., and Friedrich Büchsel. "λύω, ἀναλύω, ἀνάλυσις, ἐπιλύω, ἐπίλυσις, καταλύω, κατάλυμα, ἀκατάλυτος, λύτρον, ἀντίλυτρον, λυτρόω, λύτρωσις, λυτρωτής, ἀπολύτρωσις," (pp. 329-359) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Viertes Band: Λ - Ν. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942).

Quell, G. (ed.). "Libros Exodi et Leviticum," in Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rud. Kittel. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Quell, Gottfried, Georg Bertram, Gustav Stählin, and Walter Grundmann. "ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμάρτημα, ἁμαρτία," (pp. 267-320) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Erster Band: A - Γ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1953).

Quell, Gottfried, Georg Bertram, Gustav Stählin, and Walter Grundmann. Sin. Translated from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament with additions by J. R. Coates. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951).

Quell, Gottfried, and Gottlob Schrenk, "δίκη, δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, δικάω, δικάωμα, δικάωσις, δικαιοκρισία," (pp. 176-229) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Zweiter Band: Δ - Η. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935).

Quell, Gottfried, and Gottlob Schrenk. Righteousness. Translated from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, with additional notes by J. R. Coates. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951).

Quell, Gottfried, and Ethelbert Stauffer, "ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός," (pp. 20-55) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Erster Band: A - Γ. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1953).

Quell, Gottfried, and Ethelbert Stauffer, Love. Translated from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, with additional notes by J. R. Coates. (London: Adam and Charles Coates. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1949).

Rabin, Chaim. The Zadokite Documents I. The Admonition II. The Laws. Edited with a Translation and Notes. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954).

Radermacher, Ludwig. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Erster Band. Erster Teil. Neutestamentliche Grammatik des griechisch des neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1911).

Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). Septuaginta. Editio Quarta. 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Rawlinson, A. E. J. The New Testament Doctrines of the Christ. The Bampton Lectures for 1926. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949).

Rawlinson, G. "I. Maccabees," (pp. 373-537) in The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611) with

an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation. Vol. II. Edited by Henry Wace. 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1888).

Rawlinson, G. "II. Maccabees," (pp. 539-648) in The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611) with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation. Vol. II. Edited by Henry Wace. 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1888).

Redpath, Henry A. Supplement to A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books), by E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1906).

Reinach, Salomon. Orpheus, A History of Religions. Translated from the French by Florence Simmonds. Revised and partly rewritten by the author. (New York: Horace Liveright, Inc., 1930).

Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen Nach Ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen. Zweite Umgearbeitete Auflage. (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1920).

Richardson, Alan. A Theological Word Book of the Bible. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951).

Rienecker, Fritz. Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament nach der Ausgabe von D. Eberhard Nestle. (Giessen: Brunnen-Verlag, 1952).

Riggs, James Stevenson, and W. G. Jordan. "Daniel, Book of, Apocryphal Additions To," (pp. 168-169) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Riggs, J. S., and W. G. Jordan. "Manasses, Prayer of," (p. 545) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Fourth edition. (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1934).

Robinson, H. Wheeler. "Jeremiah," (pp. 474-495) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. (London: Duckworth, 1949).

Robinson, Theodore H. "Among Recent Books," (pp. 168-169) (a review of The Throne of David by A. G. Hebert) in Religion in Education. Vol. VIII, No. 4, Oct., 1941.



Rose, H. J. A Handbook of Greek Mythology, Including Its Extension to Rome. (London: Methuen & Co., 1950).

Rudolph, W. (ed.). "Librum Hieremias," in Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rud. Kittel. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950).

Rylaarsdam, J. Coert. "The Book of Exodus, Introduction and Exegesis," (pp. 831-1099) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. I. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952).

Ryle, Herbert E. "The Prayer of Manasses," (pp. 612-624) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Ryssel, Victor. "Die Sprüche Jesus', des Sohnes Sirachs," (pp. 230-475) in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Erster Band. Übersetzt und herausgegeben E. Kautzsch. 2 vols. (Tübingen, Freiburg i.B. und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900).

Sachau, Eduard (ed.). Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-kolonie zu Elephantine altorientalische Sprachdenkmäler des 5. Jahrhunderts vor Chr. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911).

Sanday, W. "The Epistle to the Romans," (pp. 193-280) in A Bible Commentary for English Readers. Edited by Charles John Ellcott. Vol. VII. (London and Edinburgh: Marshall Brothers, Ltd., no date).

Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in The International Critical Commentary. 2nd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896).

Schechter, S. Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Volume I, Fragments of a Zadokite Work, Edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection Now in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge, and Provided with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1910).

Schechter, S., and C. Taylor (editors), The Wisdom of Ben Sira, Portions of the Book Ecclesiasticus from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection Presented to the University of Cambridge by the Editors. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899).

Schlatter, A. Gottes Gerechtigkeit, ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief. 2. Auflage. (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1952).

Schonfield, Hugh. The Authentic New Testament. (Aberdeen: Dennis Dobson, Ltd., 1955).

Schrenk, Gottlob. "ἐνδοκέω, ἐνδοκία," (pp. 737-748) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Zweiter Band: Δ - Η. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlmann, 1935).

Scott, Charles Anderson. "Romans" (pp. 1135-1168) in The Abingdon Bible Commentary. Edited by Frederick Carl Eiselen, Edwin Lewis and David C. Downey. (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929).

Scott, C. A. A. Christianity According to St. Paul. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1927).

Scott, C. A. A. Footnotes to St. Paul. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1935).

Scott, E. F. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. (London: S. C. M. Press, 1947).

Scott, Ernest F. "The Epistle to the Philippians, Introduction and Exegesis," (pp. 3-129) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. XI. (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1955).

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. The First Epistle of St. Peter, The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays. (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1952).

Septuagint Version of the Old Testament with an English Translation and with Various Readings and Critical Notes, The. (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd., n.d.).

Simpson, Cuthbert A. "The Book of Genesis, Introduction and Exegesis," (pp. 439-829) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, Vol. I. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952).

Simpson, D. C. "The Book of Tobit," (pp. 174-241) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Skinner, John. The Book of Ezekiel. 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905).

Sمند, Rudolf. Griechisch-Syrisch-Hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1907).

Sمند, Rudolf. Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906).

Sمند, Rudolf. Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach Hebräisch und Deutsch. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906).

Smith, David. "The Epistles of John," (pp. 149-208) in The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 5. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910).

Smith, George Adam. The Book of the Twelve Prophets. Vol. II. 8th ed., in The Expositor's Bible. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905).

Smith, John Merlin Powis. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Malachi, in The International Critical Commentary. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Smith, William Robertson. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, the Fundamental Institutions. 3d edition. (London: A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1927).

Snaith, Norman Henry. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. 3d ed. (London: The Epworth Press, 1947).

Snaith, N. H. "Mercy," (pp. 143-144) in A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951).

Stamm, Johann Jakob. Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament. (Bern: A. Francke AG., 1940).

Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. Translated from the German by John Marsh. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1955).

Stephanus, R. Thesaurus Graecae Linguae. Editio Nova Auction et Emendation. London. In Aedibus Valpianis. Prostat Etiam. Apud Bibliopolas Londinenses, Cantabrigienses, Edinenses, Oxonienses, et Dublinienses. Vol. IV. 1822.

Sterrett, John R. S., and John Moore Trout. "Versions," (pp. 933-937) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. revised. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Stevens, George Barker. The Pauline Theology. A Study of the Origin and Correlation of the Doctrinal Teachings of the Apostle Paul. rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911).

Stevens, George Barker. The Theology of the New Testament, in The International Theological Library. (Second Revised Edition). (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950).

Stewart, James S. A Man in Christ, The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1951).



Strachan, R. H. The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment. 3d ed. (London: Student Christian Movement Press, Ltd., 1951).

Strack, Hermann L. (ed.). Die Sprüche Jesus', des Sohnes Sirachs. Der jüngst gefundene hebräische Text mit Anmerkungen und Wörterbuch. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin. Nr. 31. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Bohme, 1903).

Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch. Erster (Doppel-) Band. in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. by Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck. (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1922).

Strathmann, Hermann. "μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον, ἐπimarτυρέω, συμμαρτυρέω, συνεπimarτυρέω, καταμαρτυρέω, μαρτύρομαι, διαμαρτύρομαι, προμαρτύρομαι, ψευδομαρτυρῶ, ψευδομαρτυρέω, ψευδομαρτυρία," (pp. 477-520) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Viertes Band: Λ - Ν. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942).

Stuart, Moses. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: with a Translation and Various Excursus. 6th ed., corrected and considerably enlarged. (London: William Tegg and Co., 1857).

Stumpff, Albrecht. "ἐξωδία," (pp. 808-810) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel. Zweites Band: Δ - Η. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935).

Swete, Henry Barclay (ed.). The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint. Vol. III. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1912).

Swete, Henry Barclay. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Revised by Richard Rieu Ottley, with an appendix containing the Letter of Aristaeus edited by H. St. J. Thackeray (pp. 531-606). 2d ed. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1914).

Taylor, Charles (ed.). An Appendix to Sayings of the Jewish Fathers Containing a Catalogue of Manuscripts and Notes on the Text of Aboth. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1900).

Taylor, Charles (ed.). Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, Comprising Pirke Aboth and Pereq R. Meir in Hebrew and English, with Critical and Illustrative Notes: and Specimen

Pages of the Cambridge University Manuscript of the Mishna 'Jerushalmith,' from Which the Text of Aboth is Taken. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1877).

Taylor, Charles (ed.). Sayings of the Jewish Fathers Comprising Pirke Aboth in Hebrew and English with Notes and Excursuses. (Second Edition with Additional Notes on the fragment of Aquila's version of the Old Testament.) (Cambridge: The University Press, 1897).

Taylor, Vincent. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching. (London: The Epworth Press, 1940).

Taylor, Vincent. Forgiveness and Reconciliation, A Study in New Testament Theology. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952).

Taylor, Vincent. "Great Texts Reconsidered," (pp. 295-300) in The Expository Times. Vol. L. Oct., 1938-Sept., 1939. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).

Taylor, Vincent. Jesus and His Sacrifice, A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1951).

Taylor, Vincent. The Names of Jesus. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1953).

Taylor, William R. "The Book of Psalms, Exegesis of Psalms 1-71, 93, 95-96, 100, 120-138, 140-150," (pp. 17-763) in The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Buttrich. Vol. IV. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955).

Thackeray, H. St. J. Josephus with an English Translation. In Eight Volumes. Vol. III. The Jewish War, Books IV-VIII. (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1928), in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H. D. Rouse.

Thackeray, H. St. J., and Ralph Marcus. Josephus with an English Translation. In Nine Volumes. Vol. V. Jewish Antiquities, Books V-VIII. (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1950), in The Loeb Classical Library, edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post, and E. H. Warmington.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1900).

Thackeray, Henry St. John. "Translation of the Letter of Aristaeas," (pp. 337-391) in The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XV, No. 59, April, 1903.

Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. (Being: Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, translated, revised, and enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer), corrected edition. (New York: American Book Co., 1889).

Time, The Weekly Newsmagazine. "Out of the Desert." (pp. 60-68). Vol. LXIX, No. 15, April 15, 1957.

Tischendorf, Constantinus. Apocalypses Apocryphae Mosis, Esdrae, Pauli, Iohannis, item Mariae Dormitio, additis Evangeliorum et Actuum Apocryphorum Supplementis. Maximam Partem Nunc Primum Edidit. (Lipsiae: Herm. Mendelssohn, 1866).

Torrey, C. C. "Maccabees (Books)," (cols. 2857-2886) in Encyclopaedia Biblica, A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. III. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902).

Townshend, R. B. "The Fourth Book of Maccabees," (pp. 653-685) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Dissertations. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950).

Vaughn, C. J. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. With Notes. Seventh Edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890).

Vincent, Marvin R. Word Studies in the New Testament. Vol. III. (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1890). Vol. II (same publisher, 1891).

Vine, W. E. Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words. Vol. III. (London: Oliphants, Ltd., 1950).

Wade, G. W. "Numbers," (pp. 213-230) in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. With Supplement by A. J. Grieve. (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1948).

Watson, Charles. First Epistle General of St. John. (Notes of Lecturers to Serve as a Popular Commentary). 2d ed. (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1909).

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Fifth Edition. The Largest Abridgement of Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition. (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1942).

Wells, L. S. A. "The Books of Adam and Eve," (pp. 123-154) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament



in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Wendland, Paul. "Der Aristeasbrief," (pp. 1-31) in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Zweiter Band. Übersetzt und Herausgegeben E. Kautzsch. 2 vols. (Tübingen, Freiburg i.B. und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900).

Wendland, Paul. Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in Ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum. in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Erste Band: Zweiter Teil. herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann. Zweite und Dritte Auflage. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)).

Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Epistles of St. John: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays. 3d ed. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892).

Westcott, Frederick Brooke. St. Paul and Justification, Being an Exposition of the Teaching in the Epistles to Rome and Galatia. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1913).

Westminster Study Edition of The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments in the Authorized (King James) Version, The. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1948).

Whiston, William. The Whole Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, the learned and authentic Jewish historian, and celebrated warrior: translated from the original Greek according to Havercamp's accurate edition. Containing: I. Twenty books of the Jewish Antiquities: with the life of Josephus, written by himself. II. Seven books of the Jewish War. III. Two books against Apion. IV. An extract out of Josephus' exhortation to the Greeks, concerning hades, and the resurrection of the dead. Together with large notes, proper observations, and an index. To which are added, three dissertations, concerning, I. The testimonies of Josephus vindicated. II. God's command to Abraham to offer up Isaac, his son, for a sacrifice. III. Tacitus' accounts of the origin of the Jewish nation, and of particulars of the last Jewish war, with a complete table of the Jewish coins, weights, and measures. 4 vols. (Glasgow: Blackie & Son, no date).

Whitehouse, O. C. "The Book of Baruch or I Baruch," (pp. 569-595) in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Vol. I. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913).

Wiencke, Gustav. Paulus über Jesu Tod, Die Deutung des Todes Jesu und ihre Herkunft. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1939).

Williams, Daniel Day. What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking. (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1952).

Wilson, Thomas. St. Paul and Paganism. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927).

Wissowa, G. "Expiation and Atonement - Roman," (pp. 666-669) in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. V. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

Wolff, Hans Walter. Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum. (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1950).

Works of Flavius Josephus, The. Whiston's translation revised by A. R. Shilleto with topographical notes by G. W. Wilson. Vol. II, containing Books VII-XIII. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1889).

Wright, G. Ernest. God Who Acts, Biblical Theology as Recital. (London: SCM Press, 1952).

Yerkes, Royden Keith. Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953).

Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. 22nd American Edition, Revised, by Wm. B. Stevenson. With supplement, "Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands," by William F. Albright. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1936).

Zeitlin, Solomon. The First Book of Maccabees. Translated by Sidney Tedesche with Introduction and Commentary by Solomon Zeitlin. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950).

Zenos, A. C. "Esdras, Books of," (pp. 226-228) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1950).

Zenos, A. C. "Sacrifice and Offerings," (pp. 793-798) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Zenos, A. C. "Temple," (pp. 890-900) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Zenos, A. C. "Vow," (p. 939) in A New Standard Bible Dictionary. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew C. Zenos. 3d ed. rev. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950).

Zimmerli, Walther, and Joachim Jeremias. "παρς θεοῦ,"  
(pp. 653-713) in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.  
herausgegeben von Gerhard Friedrich. Fünfter Band: Ξ-Πα.  
(Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954).